

October 15, 1965

when they were told by many of those they interviewed, "We'll be interested to see how you come out."

One of the chief theoreticians of the Great Society, Richard N. Goodwin, a former Presidential speechwriter now enjoying the contemplative life at Wesleyan College in Middletown, Conn., has said that it is not "a grand scheme or master plan." That, in fact, may be its main defect.

Planning may have been a sinful concept in New Deal days. But today even big business has accepted the necessity of avoiding the slides, turns, and pitfalls of unplanned economic activity. So Goodwin may have exposed a flaw in the administration program that will make it vulnerable to a well-executed, and planned, Republican siege.

Thus far, the Republicans have failed to mount an effective opposition to either the theory or the design of the Great Society. They have been unable to articulate a persuasive against its objectives.

They have chosen to fight it piecemeal, and the lines on which they have stood often have followed the old demarcation of well-farism versus individualism, big central government versus local control.

If the public opinion polls mean anything, the people seem unimpressed by arguments that had emotional impact before the society acquired such a high degree of affluence.

Some critics of the program confidently believe the case against it will make itself, so to speak, that its greatest barrier may be the bureaucracy it promotes. It can, in this judgment, only strangle in the red tape it will generate.

It is true that many of its features require new Federal-State and Federal-city relationships, on which the bureaucracy feeds. But President Johnson, whose memory of the makeshift agencies of the depression years remains vivid, has already begun to warn his lieutenants against this kind of Federal undergrowth.

Despite its propaganda output, the glowing rhetoric that accompanies and distends each measure as the President lays his signature to it, there is little new in the entire package. It swept the shelves clean of remnants from the New Deal and a few fresh articles from the New Frontier.

Its innovations are scarce—rent subsidies for low-income families, educational clinics to modernize curriculums and stimulate new teaching techniques, health research.

The contention that it is a campaign to improve "the quality of our lives" is unsubstantiated. The arts and humanities have been boosted, it is true, and the countryside may be somewhat beautified in the war on litterburgs.

But the big nonmilitary money will continue to be spent on familiar programs—space, social security, housing, Federal pay raises, vocational rehabilitation. The aid-to-education outlays will be vastly greater, as will spending for medicare, two programs that went on the books for the first time in a major way but cut no new furrows.

Whatever else the Great Society might do to rectify what Goodwin calls "the social failures," it has yet to excite or capture the fancy and enthusiasm of many Americans, particularly the students and intellectuals.

This absence of esprit troubles administration officials.

They realize students seem to prefer dissent to consent and tend to equate the President's cherished concentration with conformity and conventionalism.

Improvement in housing conditions and educational facilities, health, and hospital assistance to the elderly, antipoverty measures, and all the other laws appear to these affluent and jaded citizens as the necessary works perhaps of an ordinary society, but not a great one.

As the Great Society unfolds, it conceivably may offer everything but inspiration

and challenge. It is not improbable these will be the next goals of the Johnson administration if current programs work out satisfactorily.

DEMONSTRATION PROTESTS AGAINST VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, demonstrations protesting U.S. participation in the war in Vietnam have today been launched in various areas throughout the country for continuance in a planned pattern throughout the weekend.

In Oakland, Calif., the members of the Vietnam Day Committee—the organization spawned, in part, by the radical student element at the University of California, at Berkeley, have announced their intentions of undertaking general operations to halt troops movements at the U.S. Army Terminal at Oakland, possibly invading the docks in massive numbers, using small boats for encirclement, blocking the railway tracks, and dropping leaflets by air. A sleep-in has been threatened, and a 7½-mile torchlight parade has been scheduled for Saturday evening—despite refusal of a police permit for such activity—as reported by the press.

Hearing of these well-organized, highly publicized plans will remind American citizens of past events at the Oakland Army terminal when demonstrators attempted to actually physically haul troops away from military transports departing for Asia, and when demonstrators stood on railway tracks in the area to prevent train movements.

Affiliated with this radical group—the Vietnam Day Committee—in "invasion" plans on the Oakland Terminal, again according to reliable press reports, are elements of the Dubois Clubs—named for the former Negro educator turned Communist who later died in Ghana after reportedly renouncing communism—members of the Harry Bridges' Longshoremen Union, and neighborhood civil rights groups, possibly totaling 5,000 in all.

Another demonstration is planned for New York City on Saturday, October 16, by an ad hoc committee, and it is stated that this demonstration will include 15,000 marchers down Fifth Avenue with a rally to follow in Central Park.

In Baltimore, Md., also on Saturday, 200 students and faculty members of Johns Hopkins University, Morgan State College, and Goucher College will picket Secretary of State Dean Rusk when he speaks at Johns Hopkins University. Additionally, if plans materialize as have been announced, here in Washington, D.C., an organization headed by the so-called Washington Area Committee to End War in Vietnam will picket the Army Recruiting Station at Seventh and E Streets NW., in the afternoon of October 16.

These are but some of 100 American cities and college campuses which may expect to witness demonstrations this weekend, these masterminders confidently state.

Mr. President, I am appalled at the manner in which students and citizens of the United States are apparently being

led or duped by persons whose plans and actions are not only hostile to the better interests of our Nation but are also deliberately aimed toward a goal that smacks of anarchy. Extremists and agitators are combining in areas throughout the country to discredit the foreign policy of our Nation and to mock the efforts of those worthy American citizens serving under enemy fire in support of our Nation's security.

The study by the Senate Judiciary Internal Security Subcommittee, issued just this week, makes plain the fact that control of the anti-Vietnam agitations, teach-in movements, and varied demonstrations so allied, has clearly passed from the hands of the moderate elements who may have controlled these at one time, into the hands of Communists and extremist elements who are openly sympathetic to the Vietcong and openly hostile to the United States. The firm conclusion drawn by this Senate committee from the evidence secured is that this is particularly true of the national Vietnam protest movement scheduled for today and tomorrow, October 15-16.

Those persons—students, marchers, pickets—who participate in the demonstrations this weekend should make no mistake about what they are doing. They are being used by their country's enemies to damage this Nation which nurtured them, and the watching American public will make its judgment between the merits of their actions and those of our American fighting men in Vietnam whose efforts they are dishonoring and endangering.

In my humble judgment, the actions announced for this weekend fall little short of being treasonous and will give succor, comfort, and encouragement to the Vietcong guerrillas with whom American fighting men are locked in mortal combat in the jungles, swamps, and rice paddies of Vietnam.

From the beginning, I have looked with disapproval upon those demonstrations in which the laws of States and communities were violated. I foresaw the time when every disgruntled group would take its problems into the streets. I feel that the cup "now runneth over," and the wind which was sown is now becoming the whirlwind. Communist elements which apparently have had a part, to a degree, in the demonstrations that have increasingly occurred in all areas of this country during the past 2 years, are now obviously becoming more bold; and I feel that the time has come when action must be taken to meet this threat to our Republic, to our people, and to our way of life.

I daresay that if the American marine, begrimed and weary from hacking his way through the jungles of Vietnam in seeking out guerrilla strongholds, had an opportunity to address a group of the demonstrators on Saturday, he could make explicit his revulsion of those who, under the guise of using the due processes of free speech, attempt to limit the support which he is due from those whose security he is risking his life to protect.

I ask, "In what manner is any person being helpful to an American soldier in combat in Vietnam when he, or she, attempts to interfere with the shipment of

"We have been racing these programs through the Senate and through Congress, and the question is: When does the sky fall in?"

Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, considered a leading Republican presidential possibility for 1968 by the pollsters, has said much the same thing in a different way. Said Nixon:

"The very things Johnson is being praised so highly for now are going to become his failures in time.

"The programs he is pushing hold out a lot of promises, but when they are not fulfilled—and a great many of them won't be—the reaction will set in."

Nixon predicted flatly that President Johnson's domestic program—the Great Society program—will cost him the election in 1968.

The most common fear of the Great Society program expressed in Republican literature and speeches is the fear of inflation.

"Inflation has begun to roll," said the former GOP national chairman, Senator THURSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky.

"It already is seen in rising living costs which shrink wages and pensions. Retired persons dependent upon their social security benefits have seen the recent increases in their pensions wiped out before the bill granting them was signed.

"Tax cuts designed to help the middle-to-lower income brackets have been swallowed and bigger tax burdens are on the way."

In speech after speech other Republican orators are sounding the same theme. The Republican National Committee has put out a brochure entitled "Those Startling Food Prices."

It contains a chart that lists the cost of frying chickens as having risen 56 percent in the last year; porterhouse steaks, 56.8 percent; bacon, 114 percent; chuck roast, 73 percent; pork chop, 62 percent, and round steak, 70 percent.

"The sad truth is that those who suffer most from inflation are people in the low-income brackets," the brochure says.

"Ironically, at the very time the Johnson administration is pursuing its much-advertised war on poverty, it also is generating inflation pressures which—in the long run—may take far more from the poor man than they will ever receive."

Senator JACK MILLER, Republican, of Iowa, cited figures recently in an attempt to show that many pensioners have less buying power now than they had in 1958 and 1954—in spite of the Great Society's 7 percent increase in social security benefits.

He said a person who has paid into the social security fund since 1940 on an annual salary base of \$3,000 has \$9.90 less purchasing power with the increased benefits than would have been provided by the lower pensions of 1954.

The loss in purchasing power compared with 1958, he said, is \$9.19.

Republicans are particularly incensed at the cost of the Great Society program—which they say the administration has never publicly acknowledged.

A U.S. Chamber of Commerce statistician has computed that the first year cost of 25 items in the Great Society program will be \$13.5 billion.

The price will continue to go up year by year, however, the statistician says, and the cumulative price in the next several years—as best it can be computed—will be about \$75 billion.

One problem the statisticians have is that no one is quite sure what bills should be included in computing the cost of the Great Society.

Senate Republicans have included 50 items in computations they have made and reported that the cost of the program in the next several years will be \$112 billion.

"Federal spending has been rising at an unprecedented rate," says Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, Republican, of North Dakota. "This increased spending includes funds for a broad range of Great Society programs, many of which are going to increase in cost year by year.

"The end result of this fiscal policy must be of deep concern to everyone. If expenditures continue to soar, we can expect only one of two results in the future—the restoration of any old taxes and perhaps even some new ones, or a badly unbalanced budget with inevitable runaway inflation."

Another issue that concerns many critics—even one leading liberal Democrat—is the way the Johnson administration has pushed the program through Congress.

The liberal Democrat is Representative EDITH GREEN of Oregon, who said after passage of the administration's education bill:

"Today it seems to me we have in the House a determined effort to silence those who are in disagreement."

Representative CHARLES GOODELL, Republican, of New York, said the education bill should be renamed as "the Railroad Act of 1965"—because it was railroaded through the House.

He said that of 29 Republican amendments to the bill only 4 were debated—for 5 minutes each—and 14 were given no debate.

"No opportunity was given to explain them," GOODELL said.

Republicans say many of their efforts to change Great Society proposals in both the House and the Senate have aimed essentially at preventing further centralization of power in Washington.

They lost almost every time—including a campaign to permit Governors to veto poverty projects in their States. They also lost on drives to permit States, rather than the Federal Government, to set standards for water pollution and billboards.

One of the phenomena of the last 8½ months has been the absence of deep-searching criticism that such a program probably should have in a democratic society.

No leading Republic personality has taken it upon himself to give a single speech in which he has analyzed the Great Society program as a whole.

Major party figures, like former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Nixon, 1964 presidential aspirant Barry Goldwater, Gov. George Romney of Michigan, and Gov. William Scranton of Pennsylvania, have refrained from attempts to take on this job.

Some of them have had a disparaging comment or two about the Great Society, but none has sought to make a detailed criticism.

The Republican National Committee has also shied away from this job, as have the new GOP leaders in the House—and the old Republican leaders in the Senate.

One of the results has often been a free ride—essentially—for much of the Great Society program. Often largely unknown Congressmen and Senators have had to carry the ball for the opposition in the House and Senate.

They have attacked specific programs—while refraining from an overall attack on the Great Society concept in all its sweeping scope.

Thus, some of the attacks on specific programs have been more biting and detailed than attacks on the Great Society program as a whole. No better example can be furnished than the attacks on the antipoverty program.

This program has proven to be one of the most popular targets of all for Republican orators and critics.

A House GOP leader, Representative ALBERT QUINN of Minnesota, has called the antipoverty program an "administrative mess" and said: "They are not helping the poor."

Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN Jr. of

New Jersey, the head of a GOP study task force, says it has been "an administrative shambles * * * a war without strategy, waged mostly by generals."

Senator DIRKSEN, famed as an orator, reserved for the antipoverty bill one of his classic performances. He gave a little dance on the Senate floor to ridicule a program teaching choreography.

In his impassioned closing remarks he said the program was "the very acme of waste and extravagance, and unorganization and disorganization * * * colossal disgrace, and in some cases, an absolute fraud upon the taxpayers of this country."

AND OTHER COMMENTS

WASHINGTON.—Here is what some of the major critics of President Johnson's Great Society have said:

Barry Goldwater, 1964 Republican presidential candidate: "There are two distinguishing marks of the so-called Great Society. First, it preaches a free-ticket philosophy in which recipients of Federal handouts are urged to believe that they are getting something for nothing. Second, its high-sounding programs are not so much designed to accomplish results as they are designed to capture results at the polls."

William F. Buckley, Jr., conservative editor of National Review: "The quality of life has heretofore depended on the quality of the human beings who gave tone to that life, and they were its priests and poets, not its bureaucrats."

Gov. George Romney, of Michigan: "The collection of programs which are called the Great Society, by themselves, can never reach their lofty goals. They are based on a partial and inadequate conception of the society they seek to build, and of the forces that must do the building."

Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania: "The Democratic Party has not moved on from the sterile approaches which for 30 years have failed to solve our pressing national problems."

Representative GERALD FORD, House Republican leader from Michigan: "There appears to be no certainty in the Great Society except debt and taxes."

[From the Chicago Daily News, Oct. 1, 1965]

JOHNSON'S GREAT SOCIETY TRYING TO MERIT THE NAME

(By Peter Lisagor)

WASHINGTON.—The Great Society can be praised or deprecated with almost equal facility because its legislative mandate embraces, in a sense, history that hasn't happened yet.

It is so tentative and vaguely defined in practical terms that it manages in one swoop to magnify the fears of its critics and the hopes of its supporters.

None can vouchsafe at this stage whether it is welfarism rampant or a progressive approach to preserve the dignity and individuality of the American people in a society transformed by population growth, technology and changing attitudes.

Any generality about it seems equally assailable.

Not even its progenitors inside the administration have a clear view of how a great deal of the legislation passed by the 89th Congress will translate into working programs.

Chicago Daily News Reporters James McCartney and Charles Nicodemus talked with scores of key Government officials in a painstaking effort to sort out the specifics contained in the mass of new measures that poured from this Congress.

They found no central sources to help them and were compelled to piece together a meaningful mosaic out of scrambled bits of legislation. They were thus not surprised

October 15,

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

26181

supplies and reinforcements which at any time may make the difference between life and death for him, and which are essential to the successful accomplishment of his military tasks?"

Such actions are alien to our American traditions—yet an announcement distributed by the Vietnam Day Committee openly called for supporters to "stop the troop train." Organizations such as that are a threat to the structure of our American society, and they should be fully exposed for what they really are, so that the American public may clearly understand that these protest movements, and these advocates of civil disobedience, have deeper purposes than those which they profess in cloaking their activities.

CIVIL WAR SIDELIGHT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Civil War "buffs" will doubtlessly find the October 12, Beckley, W. Va., Post-Herald, column by the Reverend Shirley Donnelly of much merit, in view of the light which it casts on the emotional climate of the war-torn years of the War Between the States.

The Reverend Mr. Donnelly is a man of wide and versatile interests, and I have always felt fortunate to have his friendship, having once taught a Sunday morning Bible class at the Crab Orchard Baptist Church, in Crab Orchard, W. Va., with the encouragement which he, as pastor of that church, gave to me as a member of his congregation undertaking for the first time serious responsibility as a layman of the church.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article, "David S. Creigh Was Greenbrier Martyr," printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAVID S. CREIGH WAS GREENBRIER MARTYR
(By Shirley Donnelly)

Mrs. Merritt Lowry, John Merritt Waddell, and Miss Trove Kittinger—three of the grandchildren of the late O. W. Kittinger and Rachel Wright Kittinger—live at Alderson.

O. W. Kittinger was the last survivor of those who attended the military commission trial of David S. Creigh (May 1, 1809, to June 11, 1864), "the Greenbrier martyr." The father of O. W. Kittinger was George W. Kittinger. The two men, along with George L. Knapp and S. S. Hern, were permitted to attend the Creigh trial.

After Creigh was condemned to be hanged and turned over to 20 Yankee cavalymen to march him away on foot to await his execution, Creigh told all those present goodby. The last one the 55-year-old condemned man spoke to on that occasion was O. W. Kittinger, then just a small boy.

Events which led to the trial were like this:

Creigh and his family were living in the large brick mansion a couple of miles from Lewisburg on the way to the Davis-Stuart School. It is the high, white-columned house now owned and occupied by the Boones.

At that time—the fall of 1863 when the Lynchburg campaign was about to be launched by the Federal armies—Gen. George Crook, who was in command of the 2d Infantry Division, occupied the Lewisburg area. The Federal units were planning to move on Lynchburg from the West.

On, or about, November 8, while Creigh was away from his home, a blue-uniformed man, with bridle in hand and drunk, entered the Creigh home. He began to pillage the place and insulted Creigh's daughter who was sick in bed with a fever. After flaunting some of the girl's clothing in the faces of the girl and her mother, the Yankee started to break open a trunk that was in the room.

It was at this point that Creigh returned. The Yankee drew his pistol. Mrs. Creigh grabbed the arm of the drunken soldier and thus prevented her husband's being killed as the gun discharged. Creigh caught the man by the collar and threw him out of the room.

In the upper hall they scuffled and the Yankee was shot and killed. It was charged that Creigh killed the man with a derringer pistol which he had. O. W. Kittinger always contended that the Yankee was killed as he fired his own service gun. Bullets recovered much later from the body were those of the type fired in a derringer. For the killing, Creigh was tried and hanged.

After the soldier was killed, the body was covered with straw and dropped into a dry well on the Creigh estate. There it remained until the drought of 1886 when it was examined and pictures taken of the things found among the remains. Julian Cobb of Roncoveite took the pictures, including the two derringer bullets which he later sent to me.

A slave divulged the news of the slaying to military authorities some time after the trouble occurred. This led to Creigh's arrest. Shortly before Cyrus Creigh, the oldest son of David Creigh, died, he gave the facts about the case to O. W. Kittinger.

Creigh was marched on foot to Staunton, Va., a hundred miles away. General Hunter approved the verdict of the military court and set June 10, 1864, as the date for the hanging. On that date Creigh was at Brownsburg, Rockbridge County, Va., imprisoned in a Negro slave cabin under heavy guard.

It appears that Creigh was not executed until sunrise on June 11, 1864. They hanged him at Bellview on the limb of a tree. After the sentence was carried out the body was cut down and buried in a blanket on the spot.

Six days later a coffin was secured and the body was taken to the graveyard of New Providence Church in Rockbridge County. On July 28, 1864, Creigh's remains were disinterred a second time and brought back to Lewisburg.

On July 31, a mile-long funeral cortege wound its way to the old stone church where Rev. J. C. Barr conducted the funeral service, using as his subject "The Christian Martyr." The tombstone states:

"Sacred to the memory of David Creigh. Died as a martyr in defense of his rights and in the performance of his duties as a husband and father. Born May 1, 1809, and yielded to his unjust fate June 11, 1864, near Brownsburg, Va." The grave is 30 steps east of the rear of the historic meetinghouse at Lewisburg.

O. W. Kittinger said, "I shall never forget how this good man looked when he came down to tell us all goodbye. He was very much agitated and great beads of perspiration stood out on every feature of his face. I was the last one he spoke to in Greenbrier."

SALUTE TO AMERICA'S NEWS-PAPERS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the week of October 10-16 has been designated as National Newspaper Week. I wish to salute our Nation's newspapers and the great service which they render to the citizens of this free Republic.

The Williamson, W. Va., Daily News

of October 11, presented an editorial in observance of this special week which I feel states, most effectively, the special worth of newspapers in our American way of life.

The editor takes cognizance of the desire of the American public for dispassionate reporting and expressions of opinions grounded in accuracy and informed with integrity and courage. I feel that this is a clear expression of the true mission of any high caliber newspaper and should at all times represent the goal of responsible news publications. To report news in a biased and slanted fashion, with facts chosen to fit into a preconceived editorial, or managerial, policy, neither serves the best interests of American citizenry nor of the newspaper fraternity itself.

A newspaper, as an instrument of the power of the press and a practitioner of the right of free speech, has the privilege to speak openly and without censorship, but it also has a responsibility to speak accurately and with integrity.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Williamson Daily News article, "Newspapers: Lights of Liberty," printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSPAPERS: LIGHTS OF LIBERTY

Editor and Publisher Yearbook reports that as of September 30, 1964, the 1,763 daily newspapers in the United States has a combined circulation of 60,412,266.

This is the highest circulation in history and a 2.5 percent increase over 1963.

Sunday papers numbered 561 with a circulation of 48,383,076. This is also a gain over 1963, up by 11 papers and a million and a half circulation.

All of which information is apropos of observing that the week of October 10-16 is National Newspaper Week.

These figures add up to a lot of newspapers. There can never be too many of them in a free land, however, for the quality of freedom depends in great measure on the news reporting, news analysis and news editorializing performed by an unfettered and competitive press.

The figures add up to a lot of readers, too, especially when we add some 8,000 weeklies with a circulation of more than 24 million. The circulation numbers overlap, of course; they include people who subscribe to more than one paper.

On the other hand, they do not include millions of others who are not counted in the paid circulation but who see and read and are otherwise exposed to newspapers.

It is safe to say that the individual in America today who does not read at least some part of some newspaper regularly is a pretty rare bird indeed.

Whenever any newspaper, large or small, goes out of business or is shut down by a strike, it is if a light were turned off in the community it served.

No other communications medium fills so many and so varied needs of modern life—from want ads to advice columns, from society notes to vital statistics, from comics to sermons.

Not all of these are secondary to a newspaper's reason for existence—of being a newspaper. Yet in this day of almost instantaneous electronic dissemination of major news events, even this category has undergone fundamental change.

People look to their newspaper not just for headlines or spot news but the news behind the news. They want background, ex-

or 15, 1965

planation, analysis to help them relate today's complex news to yesterday's and to enable them to understand tomorrow's news when it happens.

They want not only dispassionate reporting; they want opinion on all sides of every issue—opinion that is grounded in accuracy and informed with integrity and courage.

A newspaper is a light in its community and its country. That is why totalitarian governments, which prosper in human darkness, must gag them. That is why freedom of the press was the first to be cataloged in the Bill of Rights of the Constitution.

America has many such lights. Happily, the number is growing, despite the deaths of some and the merger of others. Each one of them contributes to the brilliance of the larger light of liberty.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The Senate is still in the morning hour.

Mr. MORSE. Unless there is further morning business, I ask that morning business be concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN AREAS AFFECTED BY A MAJOR DISASTER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 9022.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives that the House concur in the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 through 10, inclusive, and 12 to the bill (H.R. 9022) entitled "An Act to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to eliminate inequities in the application of Public Law 815 in certain military base closings; to make uniform eligibility requirements for school districts in Public Law 874; and for other purposes."

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, with an amendment, as follows: On page 3, line 14 of the Senate engrossed amendments following the word "Commissioner," strike out "to whom that agency provided free public education" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "at schools for handicapped children operated or supported by that State agency."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this matter has been cleared with the majority and minority membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. One behalf of the committee, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11.

The motion was agreed to.

LABOR POLICIES OF THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my attention was invited a few moments ago to a speech made in the Senate on October 12, beginning at page 25752, by my good friend the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower]. The speech purports to answer the criticism that I made in the Senate on October 11 concerning the labor policies of the State of Texas and of the Governor of Texas vis-a-vis the position of the Governor of Texas on section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The Senator from Texas seems to be laboring under a misapprehension.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Will the distinguished Senator from Oregon please designate the Senator from Texas to whom he is referring?

Mr. MORSE. Let the record be perfectly clear that I am referring to the Republican Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower].

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I make that reference to the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] with the greatest respect and the utmost courtesy and good will. I find the junior Senator from Texas to be incorrect on point after point that he makes in his supposed rebuttal to my speech.

I have not had an opportunity to return to my office since reading the speech of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower]. Next week, however, I shall reply in greater detail to his speech. I now incorporate by reference, though, every charge that I made in my speech on last Monday, in which I referred to the labor policies of the State of Texas and of its present Governor.

The junior Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] says that he thinks I am very much mistaken in regard to wages paid in textile mills in Texas. He may have a point of distinction. The mills I talked about are garment mills. To me, a garment mill is a textile mill. But apparently the junior Senator from Texas has another definition for textile mills.

I am talking about garment mills along the border, in which shocking substandard wages are being paid, but which, of course, are permissible under the right-to-work law of Texas.

Since 1947, when I led the fight in this body against the Taft-Hartley bill, and particularly called attention to the dangers of so-called right-to-work laws, I have said many times, that such laws would lead to just the kind of unsavory labor conditions that exist in garment mills in the State of Texas.

Next, my good friend from Texas [Mr. Tower] denies that trucks leave Texas every morning for Mexico, where they are loaded with Mexicans who are brought back into Texas for their daily work. He denies that Mexican workers are exploited in Texas garment mills

and in other Texas industries at wages far below the legal minimum wage. Next week I shall provide my good friend from Texas with an accounting of some of the wages paid in Texas, wages as low as \$12, \$13, and \$14 a week. If that is not exploitation, I want the junior Senator from Texas to give me his definition of "exploitation."

The low wages that are paid are so important a matter of international concern that at the interparliamentary meeting of delegates of the U.S. Congress and delegates from the Mexican Congress, held in Mexico City earlier this year, the frightful labor conditions that exist in Texas and other border States were the subject of an official discussion among the parliamentarians of the two countries.

The Mexican parliamentarians left no room for doubt. They believed that the parliamentarians from the United States—of whom I was one, and the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] was another—should come back to the United States, look into this situation, and do something about it.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I have tried to do something about it. Our committee held an executive session some months ago, in which session we had before the committee representatives of labor, or attachés, and representatives of the U.S. Government. These representatives talked to us at some length about the very problem which I discussed the other day, which concerned the abuses that have arisen under the section 14(b) or the right-to-work provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, in terms of this exploitation by Texas of Mexicans who are brought into Texas every morning and taken out of Texas every night, and exploited during the day by Texas employers who pay them wages far below the standard wage.

Mr. President, I am very glad to join issue with my friend, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], in regard to the matter and we will let the facts speak for themselves.

I received the following telegram from H. S. "Hank" Brown, president, and Roy R. Evans, secretary-treasurer of the Texas AFL-CIO:

Bravo. Bravo. Your statement about Connally being notorious in his attitude toward decent wages printed in the Dallas Morning News today. The industries involved primarily in the truck hauling are garment and agricultural involving from 50,000 to 100,000 Mexican aliens daily who are picked up on the U.S. side. Texans are hauled like cattle across State lines by the thousands to work in other States with the assistance of the Texas Employment Commission and the Texas Bureau of Labor Statistics. Thanks again.

Mr. President, I have been advised that a part of the truck-hauling technique is to have the trucks meet the Mexicans midway on an international bridge and load them up on the bridge, or meet them on the Texas side of the bridge and load them into the trucks, and move them to low-paying exploiting Texas plants, or

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300140007-7

credits to Rumania indirectly subsidize the Soviet Union.

These are but a few facts in support of the contention that a policy of unconditional Western credits—short- or long-term—would enable the European Communist governments to forego those reforms in the structure and operation of their economy which are called for if they are to overcome the serious problems they are now confronted with.

Left to their own devices these regimes would be compelled by necessity to drop some of their politically motivated economic policies, such as collectivization of agriculture or rigid and centralized planning in industry.

This would result not only in more attention to the people's welfare but also in a dispersal of power.

This would be a salutary political development because a government which is more responsive to the needs of the people and whose powers are less concentrated is, to that degree, less prone to engage in subversive or aggressive adventures in its foreign policies.

I have taken the trouble to set forth the facts in some detail because I think that the facts are sufficient to make it possible for completely reasonable citizens to take a stand against the proposed sale of a synthetic rubber plant to the Rumanian Government and against other similar measures which would serve to enhance the overall industrial capacity of the Communist bloc.

I have many differences on questions of domestic policy with the Young Americans for Freedom. But they were acting completely within their rights as citizens in opposing the Firestone rubber deal and in bringing pressure to bear on the Firestone Co. in support of their views.

We have accorded every freedom of action to critics of our Vietnam policy, because this is the American tradition.

It is my hope that those who may disagree with the administration in other areas will not, in future, be denigrated as vigilantes, but will instead be granted the same freedom of criticism and the same liberty of action that we grant the critics of administration policy in Vietnam.

THE ANTI-VIETNAM PROTEST MOVEMENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have sent to the offices of every Senator a copy of a study entitled "The Anti-Vietnam Agitation and the Teach-In Movement." This study was prepared, at my request, by the staff of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security.

The study points out that:

The great majority of those who have participated in anti-Vietnam demonstrations and in teach-ins are loyal Americans who differ with administration policy in Vietnam for a variety of reasons, ranging from purely strategic considerations to pacifism.

On the other hand, the study points to the conclusion that:

The control of the anti-Vietnam movement has clearly passed from the hands of the moderate elements who may have controlled it at one time, into the hands of Communists

and extremist elements who are openly sympathetic to the Vietcong and openly hostile to the United States, and who call for massive civil disobedience, including the burning of draft cards and the stopping of troop trains. This is particularly true of the national Vietnam protest movement scheduled for October 15-16.

I have been asked what evidence there is that the anti-Vietnam agitation and the teach-in movement have been infiltrated and are being manipulated by the Communists. There are a number of facts, all of them contained in the study, which, taken together, would, I believe, convince any reasonable person that this is so.

The mere fact that these demonstrations are being organized on a worldwide basis is, in my opinion, a complete giveaway. Pacifists and liberals do not maintain a worldwide apparatus. Only the Communists have a worldwide apparatus capable of inspiring or contriving simultaneous demonstrations in many countries.

Second, there is the fact that confidential American Communist Party directives to their members, which are reproduced in our study, instruct them to get into the movement and even target the organizations to be infiltrated.

Third, there is the fact that Moscow broadcasts have openly boasted that the Communists in every country are marching in the forefront of the anti-Vietnam protest movement.

Fourth, there is the fact that a number of long-time Communists have played and are playing a prominent role in the work of organizing these protest demonstrations.

The Communists are smart enough to have respected citizens heading up movements they support and appearing on their platform. But if you look closely, the hands of the real organizers become apparent.

For example, in May 1960, the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy organized a mass rally at Madison Square Garden. The members of this committee are all eminently respectable citizens. So were the speakers at the mass rally. But it turned out that the actual organizer of this rally was one, Henry Abrams, a veteran member of the Communist Party. The same Henry Abrams, I note, is listed as the No. 1 staff member in charge of organizing the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade tomorrow. I have here an ad from the Trotskyite Communist newspaper, the Militant, in which Abrams' name is listed, and which appeals to all Trotskyites and radicals to turn out.

The subcommittee study at many points identifies known Communist participants and people with long and persistent records of association with Communist-front causes, who are playing a prominent role in the present anti-Vietnam agitation.

I hope that all of my colleagues will find the time to study this publication, because I believe it will give them a new insight into what is taking place this weekend in some 80 cities around the country.

PAGEANT MAGAZINE CALLS FOR COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the November issue of Pageant magazine, on pages 4 and 5, Gerald A. Bartell, publisher of Pageant magazine has written a "letter from the publisher," in which he calls for increased consideration of the futures of our cold war veterans.

Under the title of this editorial "So That These Brave Men Will Not Have Fought In Vain," the editor truly says with reference to the cold war GI bill:

It is not charity; it is morality. It is good sense economically and socially. It proved its value in two post war periods. It is one of the few national counterpoints in the recurring madness of war.

In this article, he states that it is essential that we support the cold war GI bill (S. 9) as well as other legislation for these veterans.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial entitled "So That These Brave Men Will Not Have Fought In Vain," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SO THAT THESE BRAVE MEN WILL NOT HAVE FOUGHT IN VAIN

Amid the unceasing ideological soul searching that our Vietnam intervention has occasioned, we request a moment to plead for the GI.

We are sending him, in increasing numbers, to dismal duty. Surely a Saturday night in Saigon can be a world of excitement to a callow 20-year-old soldier—if he spends it on a date with a sloop-eyed oriental girl. The landscapes of southeast Asia and the seascapes of the South China Sea must be of absorbing interest to almost any young American male, and educational indeed. Becoming acquainted with the Vietnamese people offers a maturing experience.

But our fighting men are not sent to Vietnam for such worthwhile adventures. They know why they go and what may be expected of them. So do we. And it is time to look to the welfare of the GI upon whom we impose a heavy burden. I suggest that he deserves some of the Great Society treatment to which we have properly dedicated ourselves.

We therefore direct the attention of our citizen and lawmakers to the need for new legislative action that will give our servicemen overseas in that unfortunate land of slaughter, equalor, and misery—in a meager quid pro quo for their contribution to what is announced as our national purpose—the benefits accorded veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict.

As this issue of Pageant was going to press, Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Democrat, of Georgia, introduced a bill (S. 2127) that offers a free \$10,000 GI insurance policy to each combat area fighting man. At a 1-day hearing before the Senate Finance Committee the bill was approved for consideration of the full Senate.

If, by the time this letter is in print, S. 2127 is not a law, it is because the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs refuses to go along with what it regards as a superficial, patchwork approach to a problem that demands a complete program, of which GI insurance is only one component.

Certainly a form of the Talmadge bill, which provides an equivalent of national service life insurance, is essential. But we must also undertake such programs as a generous mustering-out allowance to assist in the adjustment from military to civilian

October 15, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

26157

which offers site selection advice. A good local school system is a "top requisite" for employees' families and therefore of a plant site, he says. "A company cannot afford to overlook the influence of this factor on retaining and recruiting key employees."

NOMINATION OF TOM LILLEY TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have today reported from the Banking and Currency Committee the nomination of Mr. Tom Lilley to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The committee held a hearing on Mr. Lilley's nomination at which he appeared and testified. The committee was very favorably impressed with Mr. Lilley's qualifications for the position.

Two questions arose. Mr. Lilley was nominated as a resident of West Virginia. He was personally presented to the committee by Senator RANDOLPH, though nominated as a Republican, and his nomination was approved by the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. At the hearing it developed that Mr. Lilley, though a native of West Virginia, has lived for some years in Michigan. Accordingly, the committee felt it appropriate to consult the Senators from Michigan for their views on the matter, and we have now received letters from them. I ask unanimous consent that their letters may be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

In addition, Mr. Lilley is resigning as vice president of the Ford Motor Co., in charge of the Canadian overseas group. Mr. Lilley has advised the committee of his financial arrangements with the Ford Motor Co., and an extensive excerpt from his letter to me on this subject is set forth in the hearing.

In order to complete the record on this point, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from a letter to Mr. Lilley by Henry Ford II be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. Also, I should add that, under the trust which Mr. Lilley is creating to handle his securities, the deed of trust will provide that the trustee is to inform Mr. Linder, the President of the Export-Import Bank, of all changes in investments, and Mr. Linder will undertake the responsibility of seeing that Mr. Lilley does not vote on matters relating to companies in which he has a financial interest.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
October 12, 1965.

Chairman A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman of Senate Committee on Banking
and Currency, 5300 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your recent letter regarding Mr. Tom Lilley who has been nominated to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank.

I understand Mr. Lilley is well qualified for this position, and I certainly have no objections to his confirmation.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

PAT McNAMARA,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., October 12, 1965.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency,
5300 New Senate Office Building.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The President has nominated for Export-Import Bank Board membership, Tom Lilley. For many years I have known Mr. Lilley who for some 16 years has been a resident of Michigan.

Based upon that long acquaintanceship, I have every confidence that he would serve with distinction and effectiveness and welcome the opportunity, by this informal note, to express to you and the committee my unreserved endorsement of his nomination.

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. HART.

FORD MOTOR CO.,

Dearborn, Mich., October 13, 1965.

Mr. TOM LILLEY,
Ann Arbor, Mich.

DEAR TOM: In connection with your nomination as a Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, I am writing to furnish you with a statement of your rights under the supplemental compensation plan.

You have unpaid installments of awards made to you for the years 1962, 1963, and 1964 under the supplemental compensation plan. As you know, awards under that plan generally are payable in four equal annual installments. One-fourth of the award is paid in the year next succeeding that for which the award is made and the balance is payable in equal installments on January 10 of each of the next 3 years, subject to fulfillment of the earning out conditions of the plan.

A summary of the installments thus payable to you is shown in the following table:

The right to receive payment of any installment of an award to you will accrue under the plan only if from the time of termination of your employment until December 31 of the year preceding that in which the installment is payable, you earn out the installment by fulfilling two conditions, essentially as follows:

1. By refraining from certain competitive activities, as set forth in the plan.
2. By making yourself available, upon request, at reasonable times and upon a reasonable basis, to consult with, supply information to, and otherwise cooperate with the company or any subsidiary thereof with respect to any matter that was handled by you or under your supervision while in the employment of the company or any subsidiary thereof.

In view of your nomination as a Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, the Salary and Supplemental Compensation Committee (which, as you know, consists entirely of nonemployee directors, ineligible for awards), at a meeting held today, considered the question of the effect of service in that capacity upon both of the earning-out conditions. The committee unanimously determined, and so interpreted the supplemental compensation plan, that (1) service by you as a Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington would not result in nonfulfillment of the condition relating to competitive activity applicable to unpaid installments of any supplemental compensation award to you and (2) it would not be reasonable for the company to request of you any of the services contemplated by the consultation and cooperation condition during the period of your service in that capacity, and, accordingly, that neither your activities in that capacity nor your failure to comply with the consultation and cooperation condition provisions would result in nonfulfillment of such conditions.

In view of this determination, you will not be called upon by the company for any of the

services referred to in the consultation and cooperation condition.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY FORD.

MORALE IN VIETNAM AND AT HOME

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, there is no 40-hour workweek or double time pay for our men in Vietnam. They work around the clock; sleep in hot and humid foxholes; are plagued with tropical diseases and snipers' bullets, while engaged in an effort to arrest and stamp out the world's greatest and most destructive disease—communism.

They fully realize that they must forego the freedoms and comforts of home; they understand that they face death at every turn in the steaming, disease-infested jungle; they understand that they are being furnished with the best available under the circumstances to provide for their protection and comfort—but what they cannot understand is the lack of united moral support from the citizenry back home.

Mr. President, these are some of the thoughts of Pfc. Donald A. Gibson expressed in an extremely well-written and thought-provoking letter to me.

I ask unanimous consent that Private First Class Gibson's letter be printed at this point in the Record, and I hope that members of these anti-Vietnam groups read it. The finger of shame is pointed at them.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OCTOBER 3, 1965.

Senator FRANK LAUSCHE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LAUSCHE: Today, as I read the September 29 issue of Army Times, I came across a news brief which stated: "Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, Democrat of Ohio, says he has heard reports that peaceniks plan to stage a big sit-down in California next month in hopes of obstructing the movement of U.S. troops to Vietnam. The article went on to say, 'He mentioned the rumor as he announced that seven Senators have decided to cosponsor his bill to make obstruction of troop or military material movements a Federal crime worth up to 10 years in prison.'"

After reading this short, and seemingly unimportant news item, I had to stop for a moment and reflect on some of the developments that have occurred in the United States in these past weeks and months.

Recently a captain in the Air Force, who after much soul searching, decided he should extend his tour of duty in Vietnam because he believed so much in the cause of the Vietnamese people in the Republic of Vietnam. This man felt he had not the right to neglect "his duty" as an American. Shortly thereafter, this man lost his life in action while on a routine flight.

During a period of time when I am sure his wife was overwhelmed with grief, having to look forward to a bleak future and the responsibility of raising their children alone, this woman received numerous phone calls, letters, and messages from people far and near. These people threatened, accused, teased, and harassed this woman because her husband, "had no business" in Vietnam, and because he "mettled."

Can any person ask more from a man than to give his life for a cause in which he believes so deeply? Is there anyone who could possibly expect more than for a man to offer his life, and the consequences of losing,

it? I for one have only the highest admiration for pilots who would set themselves up as a target for Vietcong bullets, which every single man in every aircraft in Vietnam does, regardless of his mission.

Also, in the recent past, some 3,000 persons in Berkeley, Calif., staged a stirring demonstration in protest to the U.S. policy in Vietnam. And, elsewhere across the country groups large and small have found fault with those men in Vietnam who risk their lives every day in that war torn country.

To be sure, Senator LAUSCHE, these people have the right to express their feelings and opinions. The heritage which was bought for them with their father's and grandfather's blood gives them the privilege to tell the people of the world whatever they believe. They can stand on the highest hill and shout in their highest voice and no one will stop them. In the United States, freedom of speech and freedom of the press is of the most cherished of all freedoms.

Throughout the history of our country we Americans have had to prove our right to be free. Too many times our country has had to fight for what it stands for, for what it believes in. Today in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, the United States once again has had to stand up and fight to prove to those who would have things differently that the United States stands for the cause of freedom. Not only for ourselves, but also for the millions and millions of other freedom-loving people of the world. New or old, the countries of the world look toward the United States as their one guarantee of freedom.

Senator LAUSCHE, it saddens me to see so few individuals make so much noise about our presence in Vietnam. It is a necessary evil however, that such a minority can add so much fuel to the fire of the Communist propaganda that would lead all people to believe the United States is indeed an imperialist, warmongering nation directing aggression against the people of North Vietnam and against the will of the people at home.

These so-called peaceniks with their beetle haircuts, sideburns, black leather jackets, shades, and all their other trademarks, and the Ivy-leaguers who apparently have nothing better to do than have demonstrations and sit-ins, ought to take a moment and try to understand what these men in Vietnam are fighting for. An examination of the most basic and fundamental issues at stake should merit a more mature and civil-minded attitude.

In a recent interview, Walter Cronkite, well-known news analyst for CBS talked with General Westmoreland, commander, U.S. Forces, Republic of Vietnam. In reply to Cronkite's question, "What can we do to help our troops?" General Westmoreland's replied, "Let us know if we have the people's support."

Such news as that which happened to his widow when an Air Force pilot gave his life doing his duty; thousands of people in Berkeley, Calif. staging demonstrations against our cause in Vietnam; more thousands marching on Washington and demanding to see the President; and the hundreds of other demonstrations and sit-ins all across the country, many of which never even reach the ears of our men in Vietnam, have a demoralizing effect on our men in that country to say the least.

There is not one single man in Vietnam today that is looking for any medals. No one is seeking fame or fortune. Each man knows there is a tremendous job to be done and he is there to do his own small part in contributing to its successful completion. These men are not asking for any special privileges, nor are they receiving them. Our men in Vietnam today are suffering many hardships and inconveniences not unlike those that were experienced by our fighting men in the Second World War, and Korean conflict.

Many thousands of men live with only the barest of essentials. Many live in foxholes, must diet on C-rations, and it's a chore to get a shower and shave. Thousands of men are on the job 16, 18, 24 hours straight. All must brave the heat, and also the diseases which run rampant throughout the country, dysentery, flu viruses, malaria are everyday things. Not to mention the constant, ever-present threat of a mortar round landing in their lap, a grenade tossed their way, or a single bullet aimed at them.

The long hours, hard work, and sweat, the jungle, heat, disease, inconveniences, and all the hardship entailed in fighting this war, all these can be tolerated. But, the lack of moral support, indifference, even a complete disregard of the situation by some, cannot and should not be tolerated by these men who day in and day out risk their lives to fight the spread of a greater and far more deadly disease—communism.

Because of these convictions Senator LAUSCHE, I support your efforts in obtaining the passage of the bill you have introduced to the Senate. I sincerely wish for you and your constituents a speedy passage of this bill, and the swift execution of it being signed into law.

To those who would stand up and curse the cause for which the United States fights in Vietnam, to those who would find fault with the men themselves who fight in Vietnam, and to those who would find fault with anything and everything, I for one would give my life for their right to do so.

In fact, Mr. Senator, having approximately 5½ months left in the Army, with at least 5 more months of that time left in my present tour of duty in Vietnam, I may very well have the opportunity to do just that.

Thanking you for your consideration of my letter, this Cleveland remains

Very truly yours,

DONALD A. GIBSON,
Pfc., U.S. 52595183.

NEW PANAMA CANAL TREATY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the New Haven Register carried an interesting editorial recently, to the effect that the United States has shown its greatness of character with its willingness to negotiate a new treaty involving the Panama Canal.

This decision to negotiate should improve our image in the Latin American states, where Fidel Castro and other communistic influence are so busy trying to undermine us.

A nation or individual must be truly big in character to make fair decisions when sheer force of power or influence could easily dictate unfair or oppressive action—

The Register editorial said.

The editorial will be of general interest, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, Sept. 27, 1965]

WE SHOW OUR GREATNESS IN PANAMA DECISION

A nation or individual must be truly big in character to make fair decisions when sheer force of power or influence could easily dictate unfair or oppressive action. The United States has shown the world the greatness of its character in its willingness to negotiate a new treaty involving the Panama Canal.

The United States has a population approaching 200 million and is the world's richest nation. The Republic of Panama has

a population of about 1,250,000 and is economically depressed.

When Panama demanded a new treaty covering the canal, another nation might have used its military and other powers to trample the isthmus nation. The United States is too big in principle to take violent action against a tiny country. It agreed to negotiate.

While the terms of a new pact are not in writing, the United States has agreed to give Panama a share in management and profits. We will also recognize Panama's sovereignty over the Canal Zone, including the canal, leased to the United States.

It may be said that we are looking ahead to the construction of another canal in the narrow strip of land linking North and South America and friendly relations with Panama will make such a project possible. Certainly the general terms announced by President Johnson will make lease and other terms easier to reach. There is both good business and good international diplomacy, as well as a large degree of fairness, in our agreement to scrap the canal treaty dictated by us some 62 years ago.

The decision to negotiate should improve our image in all of Latin America, where Fidel Castro and other communistic influences are trying to undermine us. We have long preached that we will not use our power or influence in any form to take advantage of a neighbor or any friendly nation. We have proved our position many times. We have both proved and improved it in Panama.

SUPPORT GROWS FOR THE CHILDREN'S ASPIRIN AMENDMENT OF 1965

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, support is rapidly growing for S. 2404, the children's aspirin amendment of 1965, which I introduced on August 12 of this year.

The purpose of this bill is to prevent the all too frequent loss of children's lives which occurs through self-administered overdoses of baby aspirin. The legislation which I have introduced would require that baby aspirin be packaged in containers of not more than 25 tablets.

I am most hopeful that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will hold hearings on this bill early in 1966.

I have received many letters endorsing the children's aspirin amendment, from distinguished members of the medical profession as well as concerned parents. Articles in newspapers, magazines, and medical journals evidence the great interest in this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that several of these articles, as well as extracts from some of the many letters which I have received on this subject, may be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted at the annual convention of the New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 16, 1965]

SENATOR MCGOVERN URGES CONTROLS ON SALE OF ASPIRIN FOR CHILDREN

(By Jean R. Halley)

The danger of youngsters getting hold of too many children's aspirin tablets was

There were no moderate forces on either the rebel or antirebel side with the will and the capacity to offer effective resistance to them. Indeed, from the dissolution of the Molina Urena regime on April 27 until Colonel Caamano formed his regime on May 3 there was no identifiable leadership on the rebel side other than that of the Communists.

VI

Next, it is said that the United States overlooked the fact that reform movements are likely to attract Communist support; that the United States failed to perceive that if it is automatically to oppose any reform movement that Communists adhere to, it is likely to end up opposing every reform movement and, in the process, make itself a prisoner of reactionaries.

This theory assumes that an alliance between the Communists and the non-Communists left in a popular front is an act of nature. This is really not different in essence from the Marxian theory that Communists are in the vanguard of all truly revolutionary movements.

In Western Europe, this theory has been proved false. By and large, Communists have failed to seize power there because European reformers were their most determined and effective opponents. In contrast, non-Communist revolutionaries in Eastern Europe and elsewhere have formed popular fronts with Communists.

The needs to distinguish between a reform movement allied with the Communists and a movement dedicated to reform in freedom should be emphasized over and over again. Indeed, it is precisely the failure to make this distinction—the tendency of some to lump all “reformers” together and to evaluate them solely on the basis of their rhetoric—that causes a great deal of the confusion.

Many of you will recall de Tocqueville's conclusions about the causes of the Reign of Terror which detracted from the real achievement of the French Revolution:

“When we closely study the French Revolution we find that it was conducted in precisely the same spirit as that which gave rise to so many books expounding theories of government in the abstract. Our revolutionaries had the same fondness for broad generalizations, cut-and-dried legislative systems, and a pedantic symmetry; the same contempt for hard facts; the same taste for reshaping institutions on novel, ingenious, original lines; the same desire to reconstruct the entire constitution according to the rules of logic and a preconceived system instead of trying to rectify its faulty parts. The result was nothing short of disastrous; for what is a merit in the writer may well be a vice in the statesman and the very qualities which go to make great literature can lead to catastrophic revolutions.

“Even the politicians' phraseology was borrowed largely from the books they read; it was cluttered up with abstract words, gaudy flowers of speech, sonorous clichés, and literary turns of phrase.”

Popular fronts do not have as their principal objective the noble purpose of democratic reform. Their principal objective is political power. They are often formed by those who want the Communist vote in order to get elected to office. Sometimes they are formed because the help of disciplined Communists is needed to overthrow a government. They are sometimes formed by politicians already in power to buy their peace. The rationale I have heard is a revealing one: “I know they are dangerous. But I can control them.” Sometimes this estimate proves to be correct. More often it does not.

As President Kennedy said in his address at the Free University of Berlin on June 28, 1963: “As I said this morning, I am not im-

pressed by the opportunities open to popular fronts throughout the world. I do not believe that any Democrat can successfully ride that tiger.”

But the point I wish to make is that Communist participation is not necessary in order to carry out reforms. There are several governments I can think of which are not allied with Communists and which are doing a pretty good job of reform. I am not conscious that this great country of ours has, in cooperating with these and other countries, become a prisoner of any group.

Moreover, popular fronts serve Communist ends. Communists gain from them a respectability they do not deserve. They use this respectability to infiltrate their partisans into the educational system, organized worker and farm groups, the mass media and, of course, the government itself. In participating in popular fronts, politicians usually have in mind a short-term, personal, political, selfish gain. On the other hand, Communists are content to work today in order to prepare for tomorrow.

We do not really have to choose between reaction and leftist extremism. There is a large and growing number of people in Latin America dedicated to rapid and far-reaching reform. New political movements, organized on an institutional rather than a personalized base, give promise of organizing and leading those who so desperately want to build modern societies. The Latin American military contain in their ranks many able and dedicated men who do not deserve to be smeared with the brush that ought to be reserved for the few. The church is providing leadership in many areas of social progress. Many of the younger men from all sectors of society are conscious of the need for change and are helping to promote it. Organized labor is growing in strength and could be a powerful influence for progress.

VII

It is also said that our country is not much in sympathy with revolution and that our Revolution of 1776 was not much of an upheaval compared to the Russian and other revolutions.

Perhaps these words are to be interpreted as suggesting that in our revolution the violence was confined largely to the battlefields, and that, consequently, it cannot be compared with the number of civilians killed under the guillotine or with the millions who disappeared in the familiar Communist purges. If so, I fail to see why violence itself should be considered a desirable end.

If, on the other hand, it is intended to say that the basic values of political and economic freedom, which were the principal motive force of the Revolution of 1776, are inferior to others, then there are differences in opinion which are indeed significant.

Our political, economic and social systems have produced a greater degree of individual freedom, a more even-handed, impartial administration of law, higher levels of income, a more equitable distribution of an ever-rising national product, more equality of opportunity, more religious freedom, a greater appreciation of the value of the spirit and of the dignity of man, than has been heretofore achieved by any nation in history.

Our revolution did not start and end in 1776. It is a continuing phenomenon. The frontiers of opportunity, of knowledge, of health, of social justice and economic and political progress in our land are being expanded still further in President Johnson's program for the Great Society.

Certainly if one compares the achievements of our system with that of others, we have no need to be apologetic or defensive. On the contrary, we can take great pride in our accomplishments and in our determination for even greater improvement in the future.

VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I made a speech the other day from the floor of the Senate in which I said that the Senate and the House of Representatives are going to adjourn in spite of my protest in regard to adjourning sine die while our American boys are dying in South Vietnam. This is a course of action which, in my judgment, cannot be justified by any Member of Congress. When the motion for sine die resolution is before the Senate, the senior Senator from Oregon will go on record in opposition to the resolution.

In my judgment, we cannot justify adjourning Congress so long as American boys are being killed in an unconstitutional war in South Vietnam. People have a right to have the Congress in session to maintain a check upon the executive branch of government.

Congress had better start checking, in spite of all the interpretations being given under so-called polls. I am like so many with whom I have talked; I am still waiting to meet the first person who has been polled; but somebody must be polled.

The reliance of this administration upon polls is an act of whistling by graveyards. The sad thing is that it is filling the graveyard, by the unnecessary killing in South Vietnam, not only of Americans, but of Asians.

I am at work on a speech entitled “The Crucifixion of the Teachings of Christ in South Vietnam.” I am always interested in Christians trying to rationalize, on moral grounds, this unconstitutional, illegal war in South Vietnam.

But, Mr. President, come next January, if the State Department does not clarify its position in regard to military intervention in Latin America, this chairman will conduct hearings for whatever length of time is necessary to make the record replete with the facts with regard to what our clear national law obligation is under the treaties to which I have referred.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record an article by Mr. Emil Mazey, international secretary-treasurer, United Auto Workers, entitled “South Vietnam Leaders No Better Than Reds—L.B.J. Backed Military Dictator in Dominica.”

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**SOUTH VIET LEADERS NO BETTER THAN REDS—
L.B.J. BACKED MILITARY DICTATOR IN DOMINICA**

(By Emil Mazey, International Secretary-Treasurer, United Auto Workers)

Some of the problems that currently face the people of our world today are the aftermath of struggles for independence on the part of colonial peoples. The difficulty in South Vietnam today is a typical example of what I have reference to.

The people of Vietnam sought their independence from French domination and finally defeated the French in 1954. The 1954 struggle was terminated by the signing of the Geneva Conference accord which among other things, accepted the sound principle of self-determination and stipulated that free elections would be held in 1956 to reunite the country.

October 15, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300140007-7

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

26187

what will happen in an entirely different situation.

What we can be certain of is that the greatest danger to freedom and to peace will come when the free world is confused, uncertain, divided and weak—when expansionistic communism comes to believe that new aggressions can be committed without risk.

In addition to these generalities there are a number of misconceptions about particular U.S. actions in the recent Dominican crisis.

III

One misconception is that danger to American lives was more a pretext than a reason for U.S. action.

This is demonstrably incorrect.

Violence in the Dominican Republic began on April 24, 1965. By April 25-26 there had been a breakdown in the maintenance of order in the capital city. Planes of the Dominican Air Force were strafing and bombing the national palace and other points. Artillery fire between the rebel and anti-rebel forces was being exchanged in the eastern part of the city. Armed rebel bands roamed the streets looking for anyone who was suspected of being unsympathetic to their cause. The police were special targets and suffered heavy casualties; for all practical purposes the police force disintegrated and police protection broke down completely. Radio and telephone stations in Santo Domingo were in the hands of rebel groups.

The first important decision made in Washington was to evacuate, through the Port of Haina, all those who wished to leave.

American tourists, unable to leave the capital by commercial transportation, had requested evacuation. On April 27 a group of about 1,000 people of various nationalities, mostly women and children, gathered at and near the Hotel Embajador which had been designated as the assembly point for evacuation. The American Embassy asked for and received promises of safe conduct from both the rebel and anti-rebel groups so that they could be moved from the assembly point by road to Haina, 7 miles to the west.

While the evacuees were being processed, an armed group appeared at the hotel and engaged in indiscriminate firing both in the hotel itself and on the grounds nearby, endangering the lives of many people. Only by good fortune was the first evacuation successfully carried out through Haina on April 27 without loss of life.

On the following day, April 28, another large crowd gathered at the Hotel Embajador desiring evacuation. By this time, the road to Haina was under sniper fire; our Embassy was informed by police authorities that they could no longer be responsible for the protection of American lives.

Meanwhile, the rebel government had dissolved with many of its members, including Molina Urena, seeking asylum. There were no constituted authorities on the rebel side. There were, in fact, no constituted authorities of any kind in the city at this time and for several days thereafter. Total anarchy prevailed.

The second major decision was to order that some 500 marines be landed for the purpose of protecting Americans and making possible the continuation of the evacuation process by helicopter.

This small number of marines established a small perimeter around the Hotel Embajador area. This permitted helicopters to land and take off and gave protection to those assembled for evacuation.

The evacuation of the second group was begun as night came on the 28th. Several hundred more were evacuated then. Around 5,000 persons of many nationalities were evacuated during the crisis.

While the evacuation by helicopter was taking place, the U.S. Embassy and Chan-

cery were under steady sniper fire, endangering the lives of Americans there. A small group of marines was sent from the Hotel Embajador area to the U.S. Embassy in order to reinforce the Marine guard there.

The facts which I have outlined are undisputed. Whatever may have been the requests or desires or recommendations of others, the action taken by Washington in the evening of April 28 had as its purpose the protection and evacuation of unarmed civilians.

We did not consider it necessary to wait until innocent civilians had been killed in order to prove to the most skeptical that lives were in danger. Had we done this we should have been derelict in our duty to our citizens. These facts are also obviously relevant to the assertions that we should have left those desiring evacuation on the beach until the complex machinery of the OAS was able to function.

IV

It is charged that the administration assumed from the beginning that the revolution was Communist dominated and that it should therefore be opposed by military force.

This assertion is incorrect for the simple reason that when the second decision (to evacuate by helicopter) was taken it was still our hope that U.S. troops could be withdrawn as soon as the evacuation was completed. There was a sound basis for this on the 28th.

But with each passing day hope had been diminishing that the non-Communist elements on the rebel side would either reach a cease-fire agreement with the bulk of the armed forces opposing them or bring the armed civilians and paramilitary on the rebel side under effective control. By the evening of April 29 it became clear that the armed forces at San Isidro would be nothing but observers. General Wessin, for reasons best known to him, elected not to support General Montas' column which was split up as it entered the city from the west, and, after some initial success, disintegrated. As it turned out, Wessin never did move his forces into the city.

Whereas on the evening of the 28th it appeared that order might be restored by the Dominicans themselves, by the evening of the 29th the reverse appeared to be the case. Rebel bands, still without any visible cohesion except among the Communist components, were roaming at will into the city, carrying violence with them. There could be no assurance that order could even be maintained in the balance of the country.

The United States Government had, of course, long since been aware of, and concerned about, the growth of Communist influence in the Dominican Republic. This concern grew when large quantities of arms were turned over to civilians and distributed by known and identified leaders of Communist parties to their partisans in the early days of the crisis. But there is a very important distinction to be made between concern and a decision to use armed force.

Thus, it was not until the evening of the 29th that a decision had to be made on whether the Communist elements in the rebel camp presented a clear and imminent peril to the freedom of the Dominican nation.

I do not know what the U.S. Government might have decided that evening had we not then been engaged in evacuation operations—had not the lives of innocent people been in danger. Perhaps, under other circumstances, we might have awaited developments for a while longer. Certainly we should have welcomed time to permit the OAS which, by this time was working on the problem, to take effective action.

But these were not the facts and this was not the situation. We were already engaged in evacuating our citizens and civilians of many other nationalities.

Thousands remained to be evacuated. We did not wish to abandon them by withdrawing our men and helicopters from the small perimeter on the western edge of the town. We did not wish to abandon those in our Embassy under fire and other nationals without either protection or means of leaving the island.

Against this background the third important decision was taken in the evening of April 29. In form it was to reinforce the small number holding the perimeter near the beach and to land troops at the San Isidro airport a few miles east of the capital.

The saving of lives continued to be an objective. But from this third decision (to land additional troops) flowed a number of actions in the following days.

First, the small perimeter around the hotel was expanded into an international safety zone, a safe haven for all those who wished to repair to it. This was done both for humanitarian reasons and in response to requests for protection from a number of embassies which had come under small arms fire from snipers.

Second, a line of communication, a corridor, was established between the troops in San Isidro area and the troops in the international safety zone. This corridor had the effect of interposing troops between the two contending armed factions. The interposition prevented a bloodbath that otherwise would have occurred eventually. It prevented a widening of the civil war. It helped to stabilize the countryside. It opened the way for a political settlement under the auspices of the OAS.

Much of the confusion concerning these events derives from attempts to lift official statements out of their time context. Statements made in one phase of the crisis were compared with statements made in another phase. These confusions have not been helpful to the American States in their efforts to find solutions to delicate and difficult problems.

V

The degree of Communist influence in the rebel movement has been especially questioned.

It will not be possible, in this short speech, to tell the complete story of the degree of Communist influence and strength in the rebel movement. The facts we already have would fill a volume. Each passing day brings additional facts to light. The danger will soon become apparent even to the most skeptical. In a very real sense the danger still exists.

All those in our Government who had full access to official information were convinced that the landing of additional troops was necessary in view of the clear and present danger of the forcible seizure of power by the Communists. The evidence we have indicates that at that stage the paramilitary forces under the control of known Communists exceeded in military strength the forces controlled by the non-Communist elements within the rebel movement. Equally important is the fact that these non-Communist elements were working hand in glove with the Communists.

The strength of the Communist component of the rebel side must be measured not only by its men and arms and its superior discipline but by the weakness, the divisions, and the lack of leadership within the rebel movement. It needs to be measured in light of the fact that the Communists were operating in a total political vacuum during the early days of the crisis.

The present civil war in South Vietnam began in 1956 when President Diem, with the concurrence of the Eisenhower administration, refused to hold elections.

The reasoning of Diem and the reasoning of the Eisenhower administration was that elections would result in the Communists winning control of the government.

This violation of the Geneva Conference accord is responsible for the civil war and conflict taking place in South Vietnam today.

President Lyndon Johnson inherited a war which, I am sure, he doesn't want. President Johnson has repeatedly stated that we are in Vietnam to maintain freedom, liberty and democracy and the right of the South Vietnamese to choose their own political path.

I disagree completely with President Johnson on this evaluation. There is no democracy in South Vietnam. There is no freedom in South Vietnam. There is no liberty in South Vietnam.

There is no representative government in South Vietnam. The people have not chosen their national leaders or their regional leaders.

There is no free trade union movement in South Vietnam.

In my opinion, the war in Vietnam is being fought to bolster and maintain an oppressive military dictatorship. The war is not being fought to extend freedom and democracy. The government of South Vietnam does not have the confidence of the people and is totally and completely unstable.

We have seen the perpetual circus in Saigon in one clique of military leaders fighting to replace another military clique for political control of Vietnam.

This game of musical chairs to see who is going to control South Vietnam, apparently has the blessing and full financial support of our Government because we have endorsed and embraced each new punk dictator who has gained power.

President Johnson is very thin-skinned about any criticism of his policy of South Vietnam.

He has discouraged free discussion of his policies and has attempted to justify his policies on the ground that he and his advisers have information not available to the average citizen, and therefore, we must have faith in his judgment and blindly follow and endorse his policies.

Constructive criticism is equated with treason—those who oppose escalating the war are called appeasers—citizens calling for a negotiated peace have been charged with being soft on communism.

Despite the fact that we have a large military force and a large body of CIA agents in South Vietnam, every time a military coup takes place, spokesmen for our Government announced they were surprised by the overthrow of one regime by another.

If our Government truly understood what was happening in Vietnam, I suggest we would not be surprised by developments there.

I believe that the President of the United States is making a serious mistake in escalating the war in South Vietnam by the attacks on North Vietnam. This policy is really the Goldwater policy and has the full support of the leadership of the Republican Party.

I suggest that President Johnson not take too much comfort in the support he is receiving from Goldwater and DIRKSEN because in 1966 and 1968, the South Vietnam war will become the major political issue and will be referred to as the Johnson war by the Republicans currently urging and egging President Johnson on to escalate the war.

I do not believe the struggle in South Vietnam can be won by negative anticommunism. It should be obvious to everyone that the South Vietnamese people have no

confidence in their government because two-thirds of South Vietnam is already under the control of the Vietcong.

Frankly, the South Vietnamese have not been given anything to fight for. Fighting to maintain the status quo is not good enough.

The South Vietnamese find little difference between Communist dictatorship or a military dictatorship over their country. I confess I see no difference between Communist dictatorship and a military dictatorship.

The people of South Vietnam look upon American forces as a replacement to the French forces they kicked out in 1954.

The people in South Vietnam must be given an effective alternative to communism or to a military dictatorship.

I suggest that the alternative ought to be a democratic government chosen by the people with a program of land reform and other reforms that can raise the living standards and improve the security of the people.

I know that there are no easy answers to resolve the Vietnamese problem. Among the possible answers are the following:

1. We ought to seek the implementation of the 1954 Geneva Conference accord. The nations that brought about the agreement in Vietnam originally ought to be called into session to seek a solution to the present problem.

2. We ought to consider giving the United Nations an opportunity of solving the Vietnam crisis. Placing Vietnam under U.N. trusteeship for a period of time and subsequently implementing the Geneva Conference accord of 1954, may be one way to solve this dilemma. I believe the recent statements of President Johnson to the effect that he is willing to have unconditional talks to bring about a negotiated solution to the Vietnamese problem, is good. However, I believe that the President is making a mistake in trying to bring about these negotiations through the escalation of the war.

I believe that our Government needs to re-evaluate our entire foreign policy position. It should be clear to all of us that our Government cannot unilaterally act as a world police force and cannot by itself solve the many problems that the years of colonialism on the part of Great Britain, France, and Belgium created.

Our Government seems to favor military dictatorship to democracy. I am alarmed and sickened at the quickness in which President Johnson moved 30,000 marines into the Dominican Republic to bolster and maintain a military dictatorship that came into power by overthrowing the only freely elected government in the Dominican Republic in the past 30 years.

Our Government gave quick recognition to the military dictatorship which replaced the democratically elected government in the Dominican Republic in 1963.

In 1965, when the democratic forces attempted to overthrow the military dictatorship, our Government finds itself on the side of the military dictatorship again. Some 30 years ago, United States marines moved into the Dominican Republic and placed Trujillo, the military dictator, in power. We must raise our voices in protest to see that history doesn't repeat itself.

I want to commend Senator WAYNE MORSE for having the courage and the intestinal fortitude to criticize our Government on foreign policy and on other matters when he believes the Government to be wrong. I believe that the best way to support President Johnson is not to rubber stamp his every act, but to oppose him constructively when we believe that his policies are in error.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, he is not the only labor leader who has diverted from the propaganda line of most of the labor leaders of this country who are

purportedly in support of war in Vietnam.

I am glad that there are some labor leaders who recognize the moral principles involved in connection with the uncalled-for war in South Vietnam; who recognize that to take the position of the senior Senator from Oregon does not mean that we get out of South Vietnam, but that we follow an international law procedure course of action that will bring others in through the United Nations.

I am glad also that there are labor leaders who recognize that no weight can be given to rationalizing our unfortunate course of action in South Vietnam by what is called the economic benefits to certain industries in this country connected with the war effort.

I am glad that we have labor leaders such as Emil Mazie, who is willing to stand up and be counted, even though the line of the American labor movement today, unfortunately, is to support our outlawry in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there also be printed in the Record at this point an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "Facts in the Far East."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FACTS IN THE FAR EAST

A general review of tensions in Asia now seems likely to feature the current session of the United Nations General Assembly, and it is long overdue. The Assembly has agreed to debate the question of seating Communist China. Vietnam has been brought into the picture by U.S. Ambassador Goldberg and by Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko.

There is in reality no way to separate one Asian problem from another. There will be no permanent peace in Vietnam without the concurrence of China. The presence of China broods over the Indian-Pakistani quarrel. Until the U.N. comes to grips with the reality of China, discussion of Asian problems is bound to appear peripheral.

This being so, it was disappointing that Mr. Goldberg, in his speech to the Assembly, should have reiterated doctrinaire U.S. antagonism to the mainland regime; particularly that he should have associated North Vietnam and China in criticizing those who allegedly do not "leave their neighbors alone." The relationship between Peiping and Hanoi is a subtle one and a more constructive statement would have been directed toward identifying the components.

The United States can make a case of course, for opposing the admission of China. It has a treaty with the Chiang Kai-shek regime on Formosa, which holds one of the five permanent Security Council seats. China has acted in a belligerent fashion toward all the major nations. It has shown no desire to become a U.N. member.

But much of this is beside the point. The point is not whether China is truculent, or whether it wants admission, but whether the peace of the world would be more secure with China in the U.N. or outside of it. In other words, the point is not whether China would be gratified by "shooting its way" into the U.N., but whether the 117 nations would benefit by its presence.

In this connection there is merit in a sort of interim proposal by Secretary General U Thant that China be represented at U.N. headquarters. He told the Assembly: "I have no doubt that the true interest of peace would be better served if nonmember states were to be encouraged to main-

October 15, 1965

tain observers at United Nations headquarters so that they may be in a position to sense the currents and crosscurrents of world opinion which are so uniquely concentrated in the organization."

The problem is urgent. The Vietnam war cries for settlement; so does the quarrel between India and Pakistan. These countries are on China's border. China is developing an atomic capability; can there be any profitable conference on nuclear controls, or any viable agreement, without its participation? Also, suppose China led a move to form a rival international organization? Indonesia, which has withdrawn from the U.N. has made such a suggestion.

A thoroughgoing debate in the U.N. would ventilate this whole situation, and would, we hope, lead to fresh approaches to the complex problems of Asia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is a great editorial from a great newspaper. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, from the beginning of our unfortunate course of action in South Vietnam, from the very beginning of the United States starting its violation of the Geneva accords back in 1954, from the very beginning of our setting up of our tyrannical puppet in South Vietnam, Dien, and one puppet after another, as one after another fell from grace in South Vietnam, has carried on a courageous editorial policy of constructive criticism against foreign policy of the United States, vis-a-vis South Vietnam.

Not very often is such courage commended in periods of hysteria in this country—and we are in a period of hysteria. I commend the editors of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch not only for this editorial, but also for the many preceding editorials they have published seeking to warn the American people that our foreign policy in southeast Asia will eventually cause us to lose all support in southeast Asia. No matter how many years are required, we shall eventually be driven out of Asia. The lesson we have to learn has already been learned by the French, the Dutch, the Belgians, and the British.

The tyrants whom we are supporting in South Vietnam have never provided an hour of freedom in South Vietnam since they have taken over power; yet they have been backed, financed, and militarized by the United States. I know from reading recent news dispatches that those puppets of ours are now trying to tell us that we must not give consideration to any negotiated settlement of the war. Of course, we are doing most of the fighting now. We have already demonstrated that the Vietnamese army and military establishment of 500,000 to 750,000 cannot whip the hard core Vietcong military establishment of between 35,000 and 60,000. It is necessary for the United States to go on in and do the job for the South Vietnamese. We can do the job. We can win every military engagement. The Vietcong cannot begin to meet American force. The Vietcong lack firepower and materiel; the Vietcong have no air force.

I have said many times that all we are doing, now that we have gone into Vietnam with our military might, is to shoot fish in a barrel, for the Vietcong can best be described in that war as shooting fish in a barrel.

It is impossible for the Vietcong to resist the military power of our great country. That is what we should expect. You and I, Mr. President, have not sat here for years, voting billions of dollars for the defense of this country, without knowing that the United States has the military might to mop up and wipe out any force such as the Vietcong.

But that will not win the peace. That will only win the war—if we want to call it winning a war. What we are doing in Vietnam will leave a heritage of hatred and revenge against the United States that will last for hundreds of years.

Also, it will do something to our national morality. Do not tell me that there is no cause-to-effect relationship between the lack of morality of our foreign policy and the moral attitudes of the young people of this country. That is why I am working on my speech, "The Crucifixion of the Teachings of Christ in South Vietnam." I believe that our professed religious beliefs should not be kept off the floor of the Senate, but should influence the action of this body.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a letter entitled "Legalized Murder," written by Dr. E. J. Fagan, Masonic Building, McMinnville, Oreg., and published in the Portland Oregonian.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LEGALIZED MURDER

To the Editor:

Now that big business, the oil companies, airplanes, steel, and Du Pont as well as others have taken over the Johnson administration lock, stock and barrel, we can expect the Vietnam war to continue for months or perhaps years and anyone like our own Senator Morse or Gov. Mark Hatfield who speaks against such murder can be expected to be slapped down by our leading newspapers.

The Johnson administration wants war and that's what they are going to get, because it's big business and keeps big operations going and a new batch of American millionaires will be hatched before it's over with. That's why war is now so popular.

I would not feel right if I didn't speak out against legalized murder by this or any other country and to my way of thinking both Governor Hatfield and Senator Morse are 100 percent right in opposing the President's escalation of war in Vietnam. I feel sure that there are enough people on the mainland of Asia to look after any and all problems that may arise in that part of the world without intervention of another continent. Minding our own business, I think, is never a bad policy. Let's try it as a nation and see if results won't be fruitful.

DR. E. J. FAGAN.

McMinnville.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a letter entitled "We Have Failed," written by Peter S. Buck, of Portland, Oreg., and published in the Portland Oregonian. The letter deals with our outlawry in southeast Asia.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WE HAVE FAILED

To the Editor:

I do not sympathize with the Oregonian's fear that Senator Morse is "weakening the

unity of purpose the President and the majority of Americans wish to convey to the aggressors." It is not the function of a critic to create unity behind the policies being criticized; if the majority of Americans wish to unite behind the President, then they can do so, but they have no business requiring that dissenters also fall into line so that the impression of solidarity may be made more perfect.

On the issue of Vietnam, I see no virtue in applauding the President for pressing with greater intensity a policy that is not working. We have bombed in the north for months and have steadily increased our military power in Vietnam with the result that the war has gone just as steadily against us. We have supported the transitory regimes that have passed through Saigon and have got, for our troubles, a general there who tells a British newspaper he finds something to admire in Hitler. We have stood firm in Vietnam, but the opposition has simply gone around our war, seeking and finding support among African and Asian nations disenchanted with American policy.

As I understand the history of American involvement in Vietnam, our original intervention was based on the assumption that we could attain our limited objectives with an equally limited effort. This premise has proved false as the effort required has grown out of all proportion to the goals. I think it time that we admit that our undertaking in Vietnam has failed and that, by choosing to intervene in the first place, we are at least partly the creators of our own difficulties. Our position in Asia will not be irrevocably damaged by Vietnam unless, by following futile policy to its bitter conclusion, we show that we are determined to have it that way. Perhaps Senator Morse's proposals will have no greater success, but I do not see how they can have less.

PETER S. BUCK.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a letter entitled "Impossible Situation," written by Eunice E. Wise, of Portland, and published in the Portland Oregonian. The letter criticizes our policies in South Vietnam.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

IMPOSSIBLE SITUATION

To the Editor:

Your editorial of August 5 entitled, "Now, Impeachment?" reveals that what the whole world has long dreaded and feared has come to pass; that is, "war by miscalculation." And American experts have made the miscalculations.

The \$700 million appropriated in May is already spent. Another \$700 million plus \$1 billion is the minimum thought necessary to carry the "buildup" to January 1. After that nobody knows how much the cost will be.

But the money miscalculation is nothing compared with the seriousness of the manpower miscalculation.

Experts maintain that for success in that kind of war, there must be a ratio of 10 Americans to 1 guerrilla. This is an impossible situation to cope with even if the war lasted 40 years and family planning was banned "for the duration." For there are already more than a billion Communists in the world and less than 200 million Americans counting every man, woman, and child.

It would seem that the time has come for nations to "learn war no more."

EUNICE E. WISE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a letter entitled

October 15, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

26191

"Gross Insult," written by Jane Erickson, of Lake Oswego, Oreg., and published in the Portland Oregonian.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROSS INSULT

To the Editor:

Anent your recent editorial "Now, Impeachment?" when the lust for war has fastened itself upon the land, the word "peace" becomes a dirty word and scathing denunciation is heaped upon those who espouse it. Carried to the ultimate, incarceration in concentration camps, and, in some cases, the firing squad, is their reward. If there are any doubts, how many saw, recently, on CBS television, the spectacle of several hundred doctors, lawyers, teachers, etc., who were brought from their jail cells in Saigon to face a row of men sitting in judgment upon them? Their crime: taking part in a peace demonstration urging negotiation looking to a settlement of the war, the very same aim to which our President is supposed to give favor. Undoubtedly their sentences, when rendered, will be further incarceration and, if the great Hitler-worshipping General Ky's wishes are carried out, death by the firing squad.

One wonders how long it will be before the same insanity prevails in our own country. Certainly that condition is aided by those who foment hatred against their fellow citizens whom they scornfully designate as "peaceniks," although among such are many good citizens, including our leading scientists, historians, educators, religionists, and many others.

Such a demeaning appellation and, further, likening our interest in reaching a peaceful solution in Vietnam to an "attraction like flies to a dead fish," is a gross insult to many readers of the Oregonian and is unworthy editorial comment in a newspaper of the usual high caliber of the Oregonian.

JANE ERICKSON.

LAKE OSWEGO.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter entitled "Minimal Respect," written by William H. Halewood, of Portland, and published in the Portland Oregonian. The letter expresses Mr. Halewood's views concerning the war in Vietnam.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINIMAL RESPECT

To the Editor:

Several readers of the Oregonian have registered dismay, in these columns, at the primitiveness of the attitudes expressed in Oregonian editorials having to do with the war in Vietnam. They may now complain of primitive manners as well.

The abusive dismissal of Senator Morse and his audience as "flies drawn to a dead fish," "peaceniks," etc., is beneath the level of civilized discourse. It would seem a modest and easily satisfied requirement of an editorial writer that he approach an issue with the minimum respect necessary to understand it and that he be capable of rational argument.

WILLIAM H. HALEWOOD.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter entitled "Man Who Thinks," written by Mrs. Lloyd Johnson, of Milwaukie, Oreg., and published in the Portland Oregonian.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN WHO THINKS

To the Editor:

Contrary to the views expressed in your editorial of August 5, "Now, Impeachment?" those interested in the peace of the world are not necessarily fanatical, nor do they deserve the ridiculous label peacenik.

Ours is a war-weary generation. We cannot see that wars accomplish their supposed purpose. Thousands have sacrificed fathers, husbands, sons, and other loved ones to these insatiable monsters. The thought of again sending loved ones into the grinding teeth of a huge war machine is more than grave.

The people of this country are already taxed nearly to the breaking point. If only a portion of the staggering bill presented annually to the American people could be diverted to the spreading of the cause of the Prince of Peace, soon this old world would be a far better place and we need not learn war any more. Haven't we tried the way of death long enough? Why not try the way of life?

As for your attack on WAYNE MORSE: If we had a few more rabble rouser leaders with the courage of their convictions such as Mr. Morse demonstrates again and again perhaps there would be less apathy among the people. As long as men in high places allow themselves to be swept along with the current instead of standing up for what they believe or know to be right, the "What's the use?" attitude of the masses will remain. The people of Oregon must feel the need of a man who thinks for himself or they would not return Mr. Morse to the Senate time after time.

Mrs. LLOYD JOHNSON.

MILWAUKIE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter entitled "Shameless Involvement," written by Peter A. Griffin, of Salem, Oreg., and published in the Portland Oregonian.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHAMELESS INVOLVEMENT

To the Editor:

In your August 5 editorial criticizing Senator Morse, you characteristically display more spleen than reason. While the use of facile epithets such as "peaceniks," "fanatical spokesman," and "rabble-rousing demagoguery" may enable you better to manipulate public opinion, they add nothing to what should be a serious national debate on a very grave issue.

The clear implication of your editorial is that Senator Morse himself advocates impeachment despite a story in the same edition of the Oregonian presenting Senator Morse's denial of this very contention. Your own moral bankruptcy blinds you to the fact that there are still Americans of sufficient conscience to be outraged at and protest the wanton and indiscriminate brutalities and devastation visited upon the populace of North and South Vietnam by our former advisers. Moreover, those of us who do feel that President Johnson has grossly overstepped all admissible legal and moral bounds in our shameless involvement in Vietnam are neither isolationists nor are words put in our mouths by Senator Morse, although we all welcome his courage, concern and support.

PETER A. GRIFFIN.

SALEM.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last summer, I said on the floor of the Senate that only by a military occupation of South Vietnam by the United States could the Vietcong be stopped from taking over the country. We are now in the process of doing that. We are making this an American war. We are doing it

on the theory that we are faced with another Munich in southeast Asia, and that the lessons of history teach us that it is better to fight a small war when aggression first begins than to wait until it has gathered steam, when opposing it will mean a third world war.

The very fact that defenders of administration policy put the war in these terms is indicative of its understanding that the American people do not want war, and that the rest of the world does not want war. Increasingly, your military activities are presented, not as an end in themselves, but as the means of preserving peace. With each fresh arrival of more troops, with each new fleet unit, and with each buildup in the size and activity of the Strategic Air Command, we hear that it is all in the name of peace.

When the bombing of North Vietnam commenced in the first week of February, this was not the case. But between the first week in February and the first week in April, when President Johnson went to Johns Hopkins University to talk for the first time about negotiations, it had become evident that the American people were not satisfied with a purely military policy toward southeast Asia. So it is vital to our policy to determine how much our military activity is contributing to a peaceful settlement.

Some obvious questions come quickly to mind. Who is the aggressor in Vietnam that is to be compared to Hitler's Germany? We say we are bombing North Vietnam to make her more amenable to negotiating; but our Secretary of State maintains that we are going to make Red China leave her neighbors alone. His speech of October 5 to the United Press International Editors and Publishers Conference, referred to China as the major threat to world peace, although Red China has not a man fighting in Vietnam, and has made available very little material support to the Vietcong.

Are we to consider, then, that North Vietnam, whom we are bombing around the clock, is the aggressor who must be stopped now, or are we to consider China, who is not physically involved in the current war at all, as the aggressor?

Another possibility is that communism per se is what the Secretary of State really has in mind. But are the objectives of Communist Ho Chi Minh the same as the objectives of Communist Mao Tse-tung? The Secretary of State is the first man who will tell us that the communism of the Soviet Union, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and China are all differentiated by their national interests and must not be lumped together by American policy. In fact, it is the policy of the administration to foment the breakup of the Communist bloc by dealing with each country in it as a totally different entity from its neighbors, and to encourage each of them to loosen its ties with the other.

Is this a sound policy for Eastern Europe only? Or are not the same nationalisms that make the Communist bloc of Eastern Europe vulnerable to be found equally in Asia?

Traditionally, there has been little to join the former French colony of Indo-

China to China. Historically, there has been animosity between them. In fact, we are not using Chiang Kai-shek's Chinese soldiers from Taiwan in large part because they are regarded as unacceptable allies to the people of South Vietnam. There are other reasons, too, but that is one of them. Yet the same historic animosities also prevail north of the 17th parallel. The inhabitants of North Vietnam have the same historic reasons for not wishing to be drawn too closely to mainland China.

We have capitalized on these historic attitudes in the case of the Balkans vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. We have flown in the face of them in the case of North Vietnam and Red China.

We have compelled North Vietnam to seek allies wherever she can find them. We say she is in a different category and we are bombing her because she has transgressed against the Geneva Accords of 1954. But we are not a party to them, nor is South Vietnam, and our transgressions against the same Accords are a matter of record with the International Control Commission, which found North Vietnam had violated them. The International Control Commission was created by the Geneva Accords to investigate complaints of violations. Its first published report in 1957, it found North Vietnam had violated them, and that South Vietnam had violated them through its military aid program from the United States. That was in 1957. In 1955, we had endorsed the refusal of South Vietnam to proceed with elections throughout the whole of Vietnam, elections specifically provided for in the Accords.

So the issue of who first violated the Geneva Accords is scarcely one that the United States can stand on as justification for our policy. We never mention our violations when we claim that North Vietnam began infiltrating assistance into the south in 1959. We had already sent in thousands of soldiers.

Nor is there any reason to assume that the United States has any sanction to enforce an agreement to which we are not a signatory. I do not know of any of the Munich analogies that maintain the United States should, alone, have sent troops to Czechoslovakia to fight the Germans in 1938. Oh, no; it is said that the free world should have united against Hitler to stop his aggression. But there is no free world unity in South Vietnam. It is strictly a GI operation, financed by Uncle Sam. The other flags represented in Vietnam represent, as I have said before, little more than flagpoles. We have symbols, some of them sent only under very great diplomatic pressure from the United States. But we have very little tangible help for carrying out our policy in Vietnam.

The Munich analogy breaks down at several places for the reason that we are not concerned so much with what happens to other countries in Asia as we are with our concept of our own American security interests.

We believe that the string of American bases and American-supported countries along the western shores of the Pacific would be threatened by the loss

of South Vietnam. That is why we are fighting there. That is why we have exalted an exchange of letters between President Eisenhower and the late unlamented President Diem of Vietnam into a sacred national promise that pretends President Diem never promised us anything. President Eisenhower upset some of our officials when he said recently that the agreement with Diem went no further than a pledge of goods—foreign aid—not direct military support. But all that was hushed up when a further expression of support for our present policy was elicited from President Eisenhower, irrespective of what was in his letter.

It is the effort to maintain an American-oriented government in South Vietnam that is the reason for our war effort there. We see it as a vital link in the containment policy toward Communist China. This containment runs from South Korea, to Japan, to Okinawa, to Taiwan, the Philippines, South Vietnam, Thailand, India, and Pakistan.

PROSPECTS FOR PEACE THROUGH WAR

One of the criticisms leveled at those of us who have opposed the war in Vietnam is that we have no alternative that will get the American Army out and still guarantee that the Communists will not take over.

That is quite true. We have no guaranteed alternative. But neither does the administration have any plan for getting the United States out without having the Communists take over. So far, their plan calls only for an indefinite U.S. occupation of South Vietnam to prevent the Vietcong from taking it over whereas we propose a procedure of seeking to bring many other nations in, not to make war, but to keep the peace, just as the United States keeps the peace on the Gaza Strip and in Cyprus, just as the United Nations moved in the other day to take over jurisdiction between Pakistan and India, and just as the United Nations moved into the Congo and moved the Russian military forces that had already started to infiltrate the Congo out of the Congo. That is our program and our recommendation.

The very best that can be expected from administration policy is that the other side will not escalate the war further than we choose to escalate it. Yet the longer the war drags on, the more likelihood there is that China or the Soviet Union will find that their national security interests require them to play a further role in the war. The bickering and border warfare over Kashmir dragged on for 18 years and it finally erupted into outright war. The Vietnam war could well be the same smoldering brushfire that can ignite much of the world. The administration has no plans and no means for ending it, only for continuing it. And it has no guarantee that Red China will not come in; it has no guarantee that the Soviet Union will not aid North Vietnam on a truly massive scale that could lead us into a confrontation with the Soviet Union.

There is no question but that the overwhelming military power of the United States can prevent South Vietnam from falling to the Vietcong. But we have

already proved that we cannot win a guerrilla war through our South Vietnamese proxies. We can only cope with guerrilla war by making it a conventional war, fought with the Strategic Air Command and the latest word in airborne, mobile operations by our professional Army.

The men who call themselves a government in Saigon are anxious that there not be any negotiations, and have protested the American offer to negotiate unconditionally. That is to be expected. General Ky and his associates have no claim to power or authority other than through the American war effort. If the American war effort in South Vietnam disappeared tomorrow, General Ky would disappear, too, with all of his tyrannical military associates. We created them, we support them, and maintain them in office. And we do it to keep South Vietnam in the war.

If the war were ended, these military flunkies, and their political cohorts, would lose their reason for existence. So they will do what they can to keep the war going and to keep American military power on their scene.

I am greatly disappointed that the administration has not taken issue publicly with South Vietnam's stated objections to negotiations.

It is very discouraging. I say to President Johnson and to the Ambassador: "You are going to find out that you cannot reconcile General Ky's pronouncements in opposition to negotiations with your promises that you are going to do everything you can to bring about negotiations."

President Johnson should put the puppet in his place in South Vietnam. The objections stated by these puppets were stated publicly, as a rebuke to the American position that we are willing to undertake negotiations unconditionally. These people in Saigon should not be permitted to speak for the United States on this matter. If they become the tail that wags the dog, the American people can expect to continue fighting their war for them forever, beside supporting them with a million dollars worth of goods every day.

President Johnson said during the election campaign of 1964 that to send large American forces into Vietnam would be to fight a war that Asians should be fighting for themselves. That is what he has now done. The question is whether we are going to do their fighting for them on their terms or on ours, and the President has the obligation to make clear to the American people that it is our Government that decides when we fight and when we negotiate, not General Ky.

IS CONTAINMENT OF CHINA U.S. OBJECTIVE?

A few minutes ago I spoke of containment of China as the basis for our policy in Vietnam. This, too, is a slogan that needs analysis. Will what worked with the Soviet Union automatically work with China, and are the conditions that made the first a reasonable possibility present in Asia?

The most serious difference is the absence of the large and potentially strong nations of Asia from our containment

network. Japan permits us to use her territory for bases; and her government gives verbal support to the American war in Vietnam. But her public opinion is overwhelmingly against it. India has never subscribed to our containment theory, despite her own ominous troubles with China, and Pakistan has decamped entirely from her once-close association with the west.

Indonesia, with her population of 100 million and her immense natural resources, is a complete question mark, except in one respect, and that is that her bitter experiences with Dutch colonialism have left her highly anti-West.

So instead of drawing into our network the major non-Communist powers of Asia, as we did in Europe, we have with us only small countries, largely dependent upon American aid for their military establishments, and not even all of those. Burma opted out of the American scheme of things in 1958 and is totally neutral.

Cambodia invited the entire American official community to leave in 1963, and to take U.S. aid with them. Mayor Lee, of Singapore, long counted on as a pro-West ally in Malaysia, now presides over an independent country and has found it expedient to dig back 4 years ago to find the means of insulting the United States.

Malaysia was once one of the dominoes we were supposed to be protecting by fighting in Vietnam. It has now collapsed from its own internal impossibilities, and the most dynamic leader in it has seen fit to cast his lot with anti-Americanism.

It certainly should not be lost on the American people that Mayor Lee, of Singapore, surely a non-Communist, has taken this tack at the very moment when our administration is telling us that our military activities in Asia are the only thing that will convince the nations and people of Asia we mean to stay. Proving to everyone that we will not be evicted by force is supposed to bolster confidence in us. But Mayor Lee is an Asian politician, and he obviously knows where his future lies. His statements that even if the British leave the Singapore bases the Americans will never be allowed in are aimed at his own population and at the nations of Asia with whom Singapore must live and deal as an independent country.

If there was ever an Asiatic strawman, that is one, Mr. President. Great Britain is not likely to leave her bases in the foreseeable future, and the United States has no intention of taking over British responsibilities in Singapore. But this is typical of Communist propaganda. They feed that kind of rot, and they are able to get by with it, because of the intense hatred of most Asians for Americans.

When are we going to learn that? When are we going to learn that Asians do not think as well of us as we think of ourselves? When are we going to learn that Asians suspect us, do not trust us, and take note of our repeated examples of stark hypocrisy in American foreign policy?

There is no Britain, or France, or Germany, or Italy, or Scandinavia to help

us encircle Communist China. Call on them, and see how much help will be forthcoming.

They have no intention of reinvolving themselves in Asia. They were beaten once. Western Europe's day in Asia is finished, and they know it. But there are no counterparts among the Asian countries, either. There is in Asia no common cement of fear of communism and a common religious and ethnic background which made possible the unified Western response to the threat of Communism from the Soviet Union.

Indeed, the only common thread in Asian politics is that of anti-Western nationalism. It vastly exceeds fear of communism, in part because the Communists of Asia are indigenous. Whatever their dogmas, they are not white, and they are not white foreigners. This is the great weakness in the American design for Asia. It assumes that our leadership will automatically be accepted as it was in Europe, when the fact is that no white leadership is acceptable any more in Asia.

This is why we are reduced to Thailand, the Philippines, South Korea, and South Vietnam in our search for support. Each is small and totally dependent upon the U.S. Treasury for the maintenance of its defense establishment. These countries are not allies. They are dependencies. They have nothing to offer from their own resources to a common cause or a common struggle.

They are no foundation upon which Asia can develop free from communism. All they do is furnish the United States the real estate for stationing American military forces. You will not hear any Washington policymakers, who prescribe our military commitment in Vietnam as the way to save all of Asia, comment on the failure of the large Asian powers to support us, on the rejection of American aid and bases by Burma and Cambodia, on the violent anti-Americanism of Indonesia, on the breakup of the Malaysian Federation, or on the anti-Americanism of Singapore. Those facts do not fit in with the theory, so they go unmentioned.

McNamara and Bundy cannot reconcile that fact with their propaganda. These facts go unmentioned.

The most that is said about these facts is that the United States has the duty to act as policeman in Asia. But it is entirely a self-appointed duty. The net result of our present operation will be, again in the best of possible results, another American enclave on the Asian Continent like South Korea, supported at a cost of half a billion a year and defended only by the continued presence of 50,000 U.S. troops even after the fighting has stopped, after we have killed the fish in the barrel, after we have leveled their industrial complexes, and after we have created a reservoir of bitter hatred for the United States for years to come.

The more dependent these few governments are upon us, the more vulnerable they become to local opposition, and if they are truly important to us, we must intervene with our military power to salvage the geography they occupy.

This is a vicious circle the Chinese have avoided. Other than border wars,

they have not sent a soldier outside their country; they give little economic or military support to any government. They rely upon propaganda, and they can do it because they are sounding an immensely popular and effective note which can be picked up and used by local agitators to great advantage. In all respects, it is China that is the paper tiger in Asia. She talks big but does nothing, even to help the Vietcong. Yet her power and influence in Asia are growing simply because she has the advantage of being a large chunk of Asia, of being kin to millions of Chinese scattered throughout neighboring countries, and of being opposed by Americans who give every appearance of sacrificing in different Asians for our own purposes.

In my opinion, the power and influence of China in Asia will grow, no matter what the United States does. China has lived as an international outlaw, and she has yet to come to terms with the existence of her neighbors. But the United States has yet to come to terms with the fact that China is no longer the China of Chiang Kai-shek. Any junta is recognized in Latin America so long as it controls its territory; but in China we spin theories about respect for human rights that we do not think of applying elsewhere in the world.

It is as hard for many Americans to think of a strong and independent China as it was for Winston Churchill to break up the British Empire. Our Department of State reflects this ingrained attitude when it speaks of making Red China "leave her neighbors alone."

Secretary Rusk has played this cracked record so frequently that at long last I believe the American people recognize that he should have something else to follow it up. That is why millions more Americans are beginning to ask, "Mr. Secretary, when are you going to lay the issue formally and officially before the United Nations, as the commitment of the United States when it signed that charter calls for?"

Let me say to the Secretary of State that we are not going to answer it by saying that all that needs to be done is for China to leave its neighbors alone. Around the world, the Secretary of State is now being asked the question, "Mr. Secretary, when are you going to start living up to your country's charter and treaty commitments?"

Yet we freely invaded the Dominican Republic when we thought our self-interest was at stake, and we did not consider that anyone else had a right to "make the United States leave her Caribbean neighbors alone." The expectation that a great power will dominate her weaker neighbors is not an expectation we are willing to accord to China. But China is there. We cannot wishfully think China off the face of the earth. It is new, it is Communist, and it is expanding its contacts with other nations whether the United States approves or not.

This is not to say that Communist China is not a virulent force in Asian affairs, or that it does not try to exert leadership for Communists in North Vietnam and elsewhere. But it is oper-

26194

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 15, 1965

ating in the midst of nations newly entered upon the trials of nationhood, to whom communism is a more remote evil than the colonialism which they have experienced, and certain only that never again will they allow themselves to fall under the dominion of foreign powers.

In this respect, China has a great deal in common with them, and it is a common cause we are making it easy for her to exploit by our unilateral action.

It was not my privilege, day before yesterday, to hear the statesmanlike speech on foreign policy delivered by the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. As that speech was being given, I was involved in difficult conferences on the higher education bill, with which we had been wrestling for a good many days in conference with the House. At the time the Kennedy speech was being delivered, it was necessary for me to confer with executive officials of the Government and to obtain their advice as to how they thought we should proceed further in trying to arrive at an acceptable compromise with the House on the higher education bill.

I heard all about the Senator's speech when I got back, and I read it the next morning. I tried to reach him by telephone, but he had gone to New York, so I left a message in his office that he be notified that I completely agreed with his speech and wished to associate myself with its premises.

That does not mean that the Senator from New York or I take the position that Red China be recognized in the United Nations. It does mean, however, that we should take our heads out of the sand as a nation and recognize that China has become a great power in Asia and that she must be dealt with. There are those who believe that she should be dealt with by destroying her militarily. I have protested that war-hawk philosophy for more than 2 years, and I shall continue to speak out against it, because we could not endanger the ultimate security of the United States more than to follow such an insane course of action. Mr. President, in my judgment, those who hold that point of view are madmen.

The conclusion of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] is quite right when he suggests that China must be dealt with in regard to nuclear control. Perhaps we cannot deal with her. We can never deal with her if we follow the policies of the State Department.

I have said many times, and now repeat, that I am not in favor of voting Red China into the United Nations until we can obtain some arrangements with her, through the United Nations, in regard to the issues, to determine whether she can be counted upon to follow the obligations which a signatory to that charter would create. That is why, as one of our country's delegates to the United Nations in 1960, I voted against seating Red China, and would do so tomorrow.

However, our Government is failing, in my opinion, to exercise leadership, both diplomatically and through the United Nations, to try to get the United

Nations to adopt procedures which will lead to an attempt, at least, to have the United Nations negotiate with Red China in respect to such problems as the Senator from New York raised the other day, and as I have been raising in my frequent speeches in the Senate week after week for more than 2 years.

CONTAINMENT OF CHINA IS A TASK OF THE ENTIRE WORLD

In my opinion, there is a much more applicable lesson to be learned, not only from Munich but from the whole of World War II. The final monument of that war was the recognition that maintaining world peace is a task for the entire community of nations. The victory was a victory not only of the United States nor of Russia, but of a great many countries acting in concert. If the war was to have been prevented, it could only have been prevented by all of the west acting together.

It was the appreciation of that lesson that caused the founding of the United Nations. Peace cannot be maintained by any self-appointed policeman, and indeed, it was Hitler's contention, too, that he was saving Europe from the evils of communism. The possibility of the United States leading an allied cause in Asia is hopeless. If we fight there, we will fight alone, and against many more countries than just China.

The one thing we have not tried yet is the United Nations. It is to that body that the community of nations has entrusted the authority to wage war in the name of peace.

Every minute we conduct our war in Vietnam, we are doing it in violation of our signature on the United Nations Charter, a solemn treaty which, I submit, is a far higher test of our national honor than a letter from one former President to another former President. We stand today in violation of those provisions which require us, as a party to a dispute and as a signatory to the charter, to lay that dispute before the Security Council of the United Nations.

We do not have to propose a solution. But until we have asked the Security Council to meet to consider the threat to the peace in Vietnam, we will remain in violation of the charter. So long as we fail to do that, we convict ourselves of seeking only the ends of American nationalism in southeast Asia, for a nation that rejects the application of the United Nations Charter to a breach of the peace to which we are party, displays much more of the truth than references to a commitment to South Vietnam can ever cover up.

Last week, the world saw a reigning Pope come to the New World for the first time in the 500-year history of the New World. He came to plead for peace, for the maintenance of peace, for no more war.

He did not come before the American Congress to make that plea, nor to the White House. He did not come to the Pentagon and beg the Joint Chiefs of Staff to keep the peace of the world. He did not ask America to act as the policemen of Asia or anywhere else. In fact, he did not come to Washington, D.C., at all.

He came to the United Nations. He called his message "a solemn moral ratification of this lofty institution," and he likened the universality of the United Nations to the universality of the Catholic episcopate.

The peoples of the earth—

He said—

turn to the United Nations as the last hope of concord and peace * * *. You give sanction to the great principle that the relations between peoples should be regulated by reason, by justice, by law, by negotiation; not by force, nor by violence, not by war, not by fear or by deceit.

You exist and operate to unite the nations, to bind states together. You are an association. You are a bridge between peoples. You are a network of relations between states. We would almost say that your chief characteristic is a reflection, as it were, in the temporal field, of what our Catholic Church aspires to be in the spiritual field: unique and universal.

In the ideological construction of mankind, there is on the natural level nothing superior to this. Your vocation is to make brothers not only of some but of all peoples, a difficult undertaking, indeed; but this it is, your most noble undertaking.

With words largely interpreted as referring to China, Pope Paul said:

Strive to bring back among you any who have separated themselves, and study the right method of uniting to your pact of brotherhood, in honor and loyalty, those who do not yet share in it.

Act so that those still outside will desire and merit the confidence of all; and then be generous in granting such confidence.

In his most memorable utterance he told us:

No more war, war never again. Peace, it is peace which must guide the destinies of peoples and of all mankind * * *. Gratitude and glory to you for the conflicts which you have prevented or have brought to an end. The results of your efforts in recent days in favor of peace, even if not yet proved decisive, are such as to deserve that we, presuming to interpret the sentiments of the world, express to you both praise and thanks.

Gentlemen, you have performed, and you continue to perform, a great work; the education of mankind in the ways of peace. The U.N. is the great school where that education is imparted * * *. Everyone taking his place here becomes a pupil and also a teacher in the art of building peace.

The same papers that carried these words of Pope Paul carried the news that American soldiers in Vietnam now number 140,000. To whom was Pope Paul speaking? Of whom was he speaking?

Our policy in Vietnam has been one of ending a war by pounding one side into the ground with the Strategic Air Command and thousands of American soldiers. But it shows no signs of bringing peace. Its advocates have no idea just how peace may emerge from this, except that they expected the other side to seek negotiations long before this, and they have not.

I do not know whether the United Nations could provide a peace that would prevent the Communists from taking over all of Vietnam. But it must be given a chance to try. The alternative is perpetual war in Asia that will carry the threat of bigger war as long as it continues.

I say today, as I have said in the past, that we have neither the manpower nor the economic resources to police Asia.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of these remarks a wise analysis of our outlook in Vietnam as written by Walter Lippmann in his column which appeared in the Washington Post on September 30. In it, he points out the inconclusiveness of our military occupation of South Vietnam, and raises the same question I have raised in these remarks here and in speeches throughout the country in recent days, which is to ask how the administration and its Pentagon architects of Vietnam policy plan to achieve peace in Vietnam by making war?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Lippmann uses the figure of speech in this column, referring to our policy, as a policy of punching water.

I care not what the descriptive terms; it is the status of posture in South Vietnam that concerns me. I would like to change the status from warmaking to peacekeeping. I would like to change our image from an ugly one of hypocrisy, outlawry, illegality, from one of substituting the jungle law of the claw, for our professed ideal of supporting the rule of law. That is my plea. I make it over and over.

I shall continue to make it over and over and from coast to coast, so long as my country does not declare war, so long as many Americans, and many Senators and Representatives do not live up to their constitutional trusts, oaths, and obligations.

I repeat that every Senator who votes to give to the President the power to make war without a declaration of war violates his oath of office, for he swore to uphold the Constitution. The Constitution vests no power in the President to make war in the absence of a declaration of war, except for that short interval of time that it takes the President to come to a joint session of Congress and recommend a declaration of war in a war message. The Congress then decides whether or not they shall vote in favor of that declaration.

If the President should come up tomorrow with a such proposed declaration, I would vote against it, for, in my judgment, the United States cannot justify making war in Asia or declaring war in Asia until it first exhausts its treaty obligations.

We stand in open, wanton, and deliberate violation of our treaty obligation. We are writing a shameful chapter in American history by our course of action in Asia.

I know that if war is declared it will become my clear patriotic duty as a U.S. Senator to do everything I can to successfully prosecute that war and help to get it over with as quickly as possible, and at the same time to do everything I can to try to convince the leadership of my Government to get back inside the framework of international law.

I made this long speech today because tomorrow in various parts of the country various groups of varied political complexion are going to protest America's involvement in war in Vietnam.

I certainly do not endorse all the views and the conduct that may be taken by some of those groups. Neither do I endorse the McCarthyism of the super-patriots and shocking rightists in this country who are already charging those who tomorrow will protest outlawry of the United States in Asia as being traitors.

Short of a declaration of war what is needed in this country is the protests of millions of Americans against the policy of their Government in Asia.

What is needed in America, short of a declaration of war, is the tramp, tramp, tramp of marching feet in the communities of America, by the thousands of communities, of free people protesting; nonviolent demonstrations against the course of action of the United States in violation of both the Constitution and our treaty obligations.

Mr. President, there are those who would silence those of us who are there to protest the outlawry of our Government. There are those, even found in this body, who believe some sort of censorship ought to be placed on free men who practice their freedom by protesting the inexcusable foreign policy of the Johnson administration.

I thank my God that there are in this country thousands of people who will be heard from tomorrow and in the weeks and months ahead and who will not be cowed into submission by the intolerant bigots of America who believe that because our country is on an illegal course of action, we must support its illegality. I shall never do that so long as I believe there is any hope of getting my country to change its course of action, get back into the framework of international law, and stand for the substitution of the rule of law for its jungle law in South Vietnam.

If the unhappy hour arrives when Congress passes a declaration of war, the senior Senator from Oregon will say to the American people that we must support our constitutional system, because our freedom is dependent upon its implementation. But our freedom is not dependent upon the implementation of unconstitutionality, and this administration is following an unconstitutional course, short of a declaration of war in southeast Asia.

So I shall be back next week, and I shall speak again and again and again for peace. I shall continue to plead until there is a declaration of war. I shall continue to plead that my country change its course of action. I again call upon my President and upon the Secretary of State to send forthwith to Ambassador Goldberg, at the United Nations, a formal request that he submit the necessary formal resolution to the Security Council calling upon the Council to take full and complete jurisdiction over the threat to the peace of the world in South Vietnam. If that resolution is vetoed, I shall then

call upon my President and the Secretary of State and the American Ambassador to the United Nations to proceed under the procedures of the charter in respect to the authority of the General Assembly of the United Nations. I prefer that course to a continuation of the unnecessary killing, bombing, and warmaking in South Vietnam.

I again suggest to Senators and to members of the executive branch of the Government that over the weekend they reread the messages of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt. I have said before in the Senate that I hoped Senators would read the great war message that Woodrow Wilson delivered in April 1917, before a joint session of Congress, in which he set forth that great principle of constitutional law for which, for 2 years, the senior Senator from Oregon has been pleading in the Senate. President Wilson said that he was without constitutional authority to make war in the absence of a declaration of war; and because of that undeniable constitutional restriction upon the President of the United States, he came before a joint session of Congress and recommended a declaration of war against the German Imperial Government, setting forth his reasons therefor.

I would also have Senators read the great war message of Franklin Roosevelt following Pearl Harbor, when he, too, recognized that he was without authority to make war in the absence of a declaration of war. If Senators will read that great war message, as well as the message of Woodrow Wilson, perhaps they will reflect a little longer than they reflected in August 1964, and reflected again this year, when the President submitted to Congress his so-called \$700 million appropriation bill for the war in South Vietnam, although at the time he sent it he told Congress and the world that he did not need the money because he had the power to transfer funds without the bill. He said he was using the bill as a vehicle for determining whether or not Congress would stand behind the resolution of August, 1964. Congress voted the funds; and when it did, every Member of Congress who voted for the bill stated that he voted confidence in the President to make war in South Vietnam, outside the Constitution, and, in my opinion, violated his oath of office.

In view of the fact that Congress will undoubtedly, mistakenly, adjourn sine die by the end of next week, I hope that the American people will exercise their precious right of freedom during the time that Congress is not in session and will make clear to the Members of Congress that foreign policy does not belong to Congress or to the President, but belongs to the American people. I hope that the American people will, during the adjournment of Congress, make perfectly clear to the Members of Congress that they expect them to return in January and exercise the great power that is vested in them to seek to get this country to lay the whole issue of South Vietnam before the United Nations for de-

termination, if the President in the meantime does not come to that conclusion on his own initiative.

EXHIBIT 1

STALEMATE IN VIETNAM

(By Walter Lippmann)

The success of the American buildup in South Vietnam has been very considerable when we measure it by what so many informed people feared last June. The Vietcong has not been able to smash the Saigonese army, to cut the country in half, and in this military disaster to bring about the overthrow of the government in Saigon. There is reason to think that the size and power of the American forces has discouraged or prevented the Vietcong from mounting big enough battles to win a victory over the Saigonese.

Yet, things have not come out as the administration spokesmen hoped they would. They allowed themselves to think that a demonstration of our ability to build up a great American force which could not be defeated would compel or persuade the Vietcong and Hanoi to agree to a negotiated settlement. Quite the contrary has happened. The position of the Vietcong and Hanoi today is even harder than it was last spring.

Why? Why, as we have put more and more of the best troops we have into South Vietnam, as we have escalated the violence of our attacks, have our adversaries become ever more scornful of our proposals to negotiate?

My own belief is that they are convinced that, while the Americans cannot be defeated, the Americans cannot win the war on the ground. This, however, is where the war has to be won, in the villages of South Vietnam, and that is where the struggle will in the end be decided. The essential fact, which is beginning to seep through the dispatches of some of the American correspondents, is that while the Americans can seize almost any place they choose to attack, the Vietcong will almost surely come back once the Americans leave.

The war in Vietnam is like punching a tub full of water. We can make a hole with our powerful fist wherever we punch the water. But once we pull back our hand, possibly to punch another hole in the water, the first hole disappears. In theory, the Saigonese army ought to fill the hole, ought to occupy and pacify the places we seize. But the Saigonese army is not able to do this because it is too small and too weary.

It is too small because the villages, which are the reservoir of available manpower, are for the most part Vietcong in their sympathies or are terrorized by the Vietcong. The Saigonese army is too disillusioned and has too little morale to occupy territory which the Americans have seized. What remains of the Saigonese army has little enthusiasm for the revolving politicians in Saigon.

There are some Republican politicians who think that this mess can be disentangled or ended by bombing the industrial, and therefore populated, centers of Hanoi and Haiphong. The President, fortunately, has resisted the temptation to make the war a total war, and thus to make it a general Asian war.

In any event, our adversaries in the Vietcong and in Hanoi show no signs of being intimidated by the possibility of total war. The Vietcong in the south are already receiving the full treatment of total war by our area bombing, and the North Vietnamese do not value their material possessions, which are few, nor even their lives, which are short and unhappy, as do the people of a country who have much to lose and much to live for.

Our adversaries, moreover, have time to wait, time to retreat, to hide, and to live to fight another day. So we shall be forced

to face the fact that in order to win the war in South Vietnam we shall have to occupy South Vietnam with American troops. A few months ago Mr. Hanson Baldwin, the military correspondent of the New York Times, called for a million men for Vietnam. It sounded fantastic at the time in the light of what President Johnson was saying about not wanting a wider war. But it is beginning to look very much as if Mr. Baldwin had made an informed and realistic estimate of what a military solution would require.

The situation has become so tangled that no clear and decisive solution is for the present conceivable. The President is no nearer the negotiated settlement which he has hoped to bring about. Nor, as a matter of fact, is the administration truly resolved to negotiate in a sense that it is prepared, even in its private thinking, to make the concessions that any successful negotiation is bound to call for.

Failing the prospect of a settlement, the President has managed to obtain the assent of most of the country to the kind of war we are fighting—a sporadic, low-grade war carried on chiefly by a professional American army. There is no immediate prospect of big battles with big casualties because the Vietcong, so it would seem, have withdrawn into guerrilla warfare. Against the kind of force we have in Vietnam, guerrilla warfare cannot win a victory. But neither can the guerrillas be defeated decisively and put out of business.

If we cannot or will not escalate the war until we have an enormous army which can occupy the country, our best course is to dig in along the coast and begin to discuss with the Vietnamese politicians the formation of a government in Saigon which can negotiate a truce in the civil war. This course will not please the majority of the President's current advisers. But with all due respect to them, how do they propose to win this war, specifically, what size of American army are they prepared to draft and put into Indochina? For the war is not going to be won by punching the water.

SWANSTON EQUIPMENT CO.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 839, S. 317.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 317) for the relief of the Swanston Equipment Co.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments in line 6, after the word "of", where it appears the second time, to strike out "\$40,377.19" and insert "\$21,376"; and, in line 8, after the word "as", to strike out "excise taxes and"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Swanston Equipment Company, of Fargo, North Dakota, the sum of \$21,376, representing the sum of the amounts such company was erroneously required to pay as customs duties in connection with the importation from Canada by it of certain farm machinery and equipment (including farm

hoists) during the period beginning October 6, 1956, and ending with the close of May 14, 1959.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 854), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to pay to the claimant the sum of \$21,376, the amount of customs duties paid in connection with the importation of certain farm machinery and equipment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill, as amended, is to pay the claimant \$21,376, representing customs duties paid in connection with importation of certain hydraulic truck hoists and parts thereof from Canada.

During the period beginning in April 1956 and ending in June 1959, claimant imported and sold to dealers in the United States farm conversion truck hoists for installation on ordinary 1½-ton trucks used by farmers. Such hoists operated to raise the front end of the truck wagon box so that the load could be dumped out at the tailgate.

Early in 1959 a special agent of the Internal Revenue Service discovered that the quarterly excise tax returns for the periods ending June 30, 1956, through June 30, 1959, had not been filed and the excise tax imposed by the Internal Revenue Code on the hoists sold during those periods had not been paid. The taxpayer sought a ruling that the hoists were not taxable because, first, they were mounted on trucks used only for agricultural purposes; and second, they were exempt from excise taxes because they were subject to the import tariff. The Internal Revenue Service rejected these arguments as being contrary to the Internal Revenue Code and ruled that the hoists were taxable. Claimant then was heard in the appellate division on the ground that the customs duties were improperly collected and as such should be allowed as offset against the excise tax liability on the basis of the doctrine of equitable recoupment. This claim was overruled on the grounds that, first, a requirement for free entry as an agricultural implement is that the implement must be chiefly used throughout the United States for agricultural purposes; and second, available evidence did not establish that these hydraulic hoists were chiefly used in the United States for agricultural purposes.

On June 23, 1963, the taxpayer made an offer in compromise of the excise tax liability, including penalty and interest. Included with the offer in compromise was a check for \$7,961.75, which was tendered conditional upon acceptance of the offer.

During the conferences concerning this offer in compromise, the president of the claimant company stated he had relied upon the advice of an employee of the Small Business Administration, that the hoists were not subject to excise tax if customs duties had been paid on the hoists. On August 30, 1963, the offer in